



## LEGISLATIVE BRIEFING

Iowa Department of Education

# Educator Quality in Iowa

---

### ➔ What is it?

Iowa's Educator Quality initiatives are reshaping how teachers in our state are supported and compensated. Research clearly shows that teachers have the greatest impact on student achievement. This is a foundation of Iowa's approach to enhancing student success in Iowa's school. Therefore, Iowa is working to help ensure a quality teacher stands in every Iowa classroom. The state is doing this through the following Educator Quality Initiatives:

- Iowa Department of Education (Department)-sponsored Professional Development
- District and Individual Career Development Plans
- Teacher Evaluation
- Iowa Professional Development Model
- Mentoring and Induction
- National Board Certification
- Teacher Compensation

### ➔ When did it come about?

In 2001, the Iowa legislature passed legislation establishing the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality program, Iowa Code Section 284.12(1). This legislation requires the Iowa Department of Education (Department) to annually report information related to educator quality, such as the statewide progress on student achievement scores and improvements in the evaluation of teachers under the Iowa Teaching Standards.

Specific areas that have been implemented are:

- Mentoring and induction for beginning teachers and administrators;
- Eight Iowa teaching standards and 42 criteria defining expectations for all teachers;
- Two levels, beginning and career, of a four-level career ladder based on skills and knowledge;
- An increased minimum salary level for beginning and Career I teachers;
- Team-based variable pay pilots.

Since that time, Iowa has made adjustments to existing programs and added others to help support educators in their efforts to provide world-class education.

*(Continued)*



## LEGISLATIVE BRIEFING

Iowa Department of Education

### ➔ Where does this initiative currently stand?

Over years, the Iowa has reviewed its Educator Quality programs to ensure it continues to meet the mission of improving student achievement. For example, the Department has established Iowa Teacher Development Academies (ITEDAs) under its professional development initiatives. The ITEDAs feature research-based content and are designed to support local school districts and Iowa's Area Education Agencies (AEAs) in offering professional development based on the Iowa Professional Development Model. Iowa's districts have had the opportunity to participate in ITEDAs during the past three years.

Another change is Iowa's move from Team-Based Variable Pay (TBVP) established in 2001 to Pay-for-Performance pilot programs. Established in 2006 by House File 2792 and Executive Order #48, a Teacher Pay-for-Performance (PFP) Commission was created to design and implement a pay-for-performance program; provide a study relating to teacher and staff compensation

(Continued)

### Educator Quality Initiatives in Iowa

#### Iowa Department of Education-sponsored Professional Development

One example is the Iowa Teacher Development Academies (ITEDAs), which feature research-based content. They include Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI), Concept Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI), Question Answer Relationships (QAR), and Second Chance Reading (SCR).

#### District & Individual Career Development Plans

Individual Career Development Plans are intended to support the professional growth of individual teachers as part of the district's focus on increasing achievement for all students. The plans are based on the needs of the teacher; the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria; and the student achievement goals of the building and district as per the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan. District Career Development Plan (DCDP) helps administrators make connections between the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) structure and the Iowa Professional Development Model.

#### Teacher Evaluation

Teacher Evaluation is a way to determine whether or not a teacher is providing quality instruction in the classroom. In general, this is done through continuous monitoring of the classroom through observations, conferencing with the teacher, setting goals, monitoring student learning, and communicating results. All teachers in Iowa must be evaluated by an educator who has successfully completed an evaluator approval program.

#### Iowa Professional Development Model

The intent of the Iowa Professional Development Model is to provide a structure for professional development that is focused, collaborative, and that directly supports the district Comprehensive School Improvement Process (CSIP) goals for student achievement.

#### Mentoring and Induction

Every new teacher in the first or second year of the profession enters into a two-year induction program that addresses the teacher's personal and professional needs and provides assistance to demonstrate competence on the Iowa Teaching Standards. A mentor is assigned to each teacher to observe, critique, and provide support and advice on effective teaching practices. Monetary compensation is provided to mentors supported by a state appropriation.

#### National Board Certification

National Board Certification (NBC) is a certification program designed and administered by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

#### Teacher Compensation

In 2006, Iowa established Teacher Pay-for-Performance (PFP) pilot programs to establish the effectiveness of such teacher compensation method. In addition, Career Ladders were established by the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program, but only the first two steps of the career ladder were implemented at the time. Pilot programs are currently being evaluated.



## LEGISLATIVE BRIEFING

Iowa Department of Education

structures containing pay-for-performance components; and initiate pilot projects to test the effectiveness of pay-for-performance programs.

In addition, the National Board Certification (NBC) process was not reinstated by the 2008 legislature, but funding will be in place to continue the commitment to those individuals that were in the process prior to December 31, 2007. In Iowa, 626 educators have successfully completed the process. NBC is a certification program designed and administered by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

### ➔ **How has this initiative helped Iowa students?**

Research shows that the most effective teachers are producing not just a little more growth, but as many as six times the learning gains produced by least effective teachers. It also shows that these effects accumulate over the grade levels, with initially similar-achieving students separated by as many as 50 percentile points three years later based solely on the quality of the teachers to which they were assigned.

Most importantly, these differences are not explained by differences in the race, socioeconomic, or prior achievement of the students, but mainly by the differences in the quality of the teachers.

Iowa must provide the very best teachers for our students and Iowa's Educator Quality initiatives are helping to do just that.

### ➔ **Where can I get more information?**

Please visit the following links for specific programs:

- Iowa Department of Education (Department)-sponsored Professional Development:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=295&Itemid=1281](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=295&Itemid=1281)
- District and Individual Career Development Plans:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=296&Itemid=1282](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=296&Itemid=1282)
- Teacher Evaluation:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=538&Itemid=1290](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=538&Itemid=1290)
- Iowa Professional Development Model:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=232&Itemid=1286](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=232&Itemid=1286)
- Mentoring and Induction:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=481&Itemid=1287](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=481&Itemid=1287)
- National Board Certification:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=282&Itemid=1288](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=282&Itemid=1288)
- Teacher Compensation:  
[http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=475&Itemid=1291](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=475&Itemid=1291)

Additional information also follows this brief.



# **Student Achievement and Accountability**

## **Annual Report**

**Iowa Code Section 284.12(1)**

**Iowa Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319**

**January 2009**

State of Iowa  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

## **State Board of Education**

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton  
Kameron Dodge, Student Member, Cambridge  
Vacant

## **Administration**

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

### **Division of PK-12 Education**

Kevin Fangman, Administrator  
Mary Beth Schroeder Fracek, Administrative Consultant  
Deb Hansen, Administrative Consultant  
Matt Ludwig, Consultant

### **Division of School Support and Information**

Tom Deeter, Lead Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, *et seq.*), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.

**Iowa Department of Education  
Annual Report 2007  
As Required by Iowa Code Section 284.12(1)  
Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program**

Legislation passed during the 2001 Iowa legislative session established the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program, Iowa Code Section 284.12(1). This legislation requires the Iowa Department of Education (DE) to annually report the statewide progress on the following: student achievement scores in mathematics and reading at the fourth and eighth grade levels on a district-by-district basis; evaluator training program; team-based variable pay for student achievement; and changes and improvements in the evaluation of teachers under the Iowa Teaching Standards. The report is being made available to the chairpersons and ranking members of the senate and house committees on education, the legislative education accountability and oversight committee, the deans of the colleges of education at approved practitioner preparation institutions in this state, the State Board of Education, the governor, and school districts.

**Student Achievement Scores in Mathematics and Reading at the Fourth and  
Eighth Grade Levels on a District-by-District Basis  
2006-07 & 2007-08 Biennium Adequate Yearly Progress Report Percentage of  
Students Proficient (Iowa School Districts)**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>4th Grade Reading</b>	<b>4th Grade Math</b>	<b>8th Grade Reading</b>	<b>8th Grade Math</b>
Adair-Casey CSD	64.81	75.93	70.59	78.43
Adel-DeSoto-Minburn CSD	83.94	84.86	79.83	81.55
AGWSR CSD	74.07	77.78	67.02	81.91
A-H-S-T CSD	74.42	84.88	80.28	91.55
Akron Westfield CSD	93.33	88.33	79.73	77.03
Albert City-Truesdale CSD	94.44	94.44	to Sioux Central	
Albia CSD	78.34	78.34	68.00	76.30
Alburnett CSD	80.20	82.18	83.33	86.67
Alden CSD	60.87	86.96	to Iowa Falls	
Algona CSD	88.51	87.16	83.96	84.57
Allamakee CSD	84.91	86.79	81.71	83.59
Allison-Bristow CSD	89.19	75.68	80.82	89.04
Alta CSD	87.88	89.39	74.19	82.80
Ames CSD	88.08	84.82	86.24	88.23
Anamosa CSD	86.67	85.23	70.79	73.76
Andrew CSD	82.35	97.06	77.27	86.05
Anita CSD	74.19	87.10	to C and M	
Ankeny CSD	88.28	90.52	83.35	87.21
Anthon-Oto CSD	76.00	92.00	64.06	66.41
Aplington-Parkersburg CSD	80.18	81.08	70.54	76.79
Armstrong-Ringsted CSD	78.26	82.61	62.75	64.71

Agency	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	8th Grade Reading	8th Grade Math
Ar-We-Va CSD	83.33	97.22	72.92	79.17
Atlantic CSD	77.27	83.52	69.67	78.10
Audubon CSD	79.78	82.02	76.70	92.23
Aurelia CSD	78.79	87.88	79.31	68.97
Ballard CSD	86.45	89.25	75.24	80.58
Battle Creek-Ida Grove CSD	90.70	87.21	83.02	86.79
Baxter CSD	79.66	89.83	82.76	84.48
BCLUW CSD	83.33	83.33	83.17	83.17
Bedford CSD	93.85	93.85	78.08	82.19
Belle Plaine CSD	77.19	75.44	75.00	75.00
Bellevue CSD	82.42	86.81	80.00	69.47
Belmond-Klemme CSD	87.25	85.29	64.36	57.43
Bennett CSD	82.61	91.30	to Durant	
Benton CSD	86.77	89.95	74.21	76.98
Bettendorf CSD	84.13	86.92	81.57	83.01
Bondurant-Farrar CSD	87.65	85.80	75.60	82.74
Boone CSD	80.00	78.98	63.21	78.23
Boyden-Hull CSD	76.53	72.73	68.54	83.15
Boyer Valley CSD	66.13	66.13	83.56	73.97
Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom CSD	75.86	82.76	73.91	73.91
Burlington CSD	76.65	77.31	68.95	66.39
C and M CSD	76.92	84.62	74.63	88.06
CAL CSD	75.76	72.73	74.29	76.47
Calamus-Wheatland CSD	77.38	84.52	72.73	78.41
Camanche CSD	75.34	80.82	58.04	62.94
Cardinal CSD	66.67	71.26	63.03	66.39
Carlisle CSD	88.21	91.63	76.92	80.69
Carroll CSD	83.41	89.91	81.56	83.69
Cedar Falls CSD	90.71	93.33	82.37	85.07
Cedar Rapids CSD	74.90	75.94	73.10	75.06
Center Point-Urbana CSD	81.87	80.00	85.42	90.10
Centerville CSD	70.59	73.12	75.45	77.17
Central City CSD	75.71	90.00	70.00	71.43
Central Clinton CSD	86.03	86.41	80.75	86.45
Central CSD	81.16	84.06	77.22	77.22
Central Decatur CSD	70.71	70.71	70.71	70.71
Central Lee CSD	86.01	90.91	71.33	75.33
Central Lyon CSD	96.10	93.51	75.49	81.37
Chariton CSD	82.26	79.03	81.30	87.83
Charles City CSD	86.75	85.54	71.43	73.47
Charter Oak-Ute CSD	67.57	64.86	70.21	85.11
Cherokee CSD	77.52	79.84	79.02	78.87
Clarinda CSD	78.15	71.43	77.78	82.91
Clarion-Goldfield CSD	76.52	76.32	81.02	88.32
Clarke CSD	76.69	74.69	75.96	76.50
Clarksville CSD	89.36	93.62	49.15	59.32

Agency	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	8th Grade Reading	8th Grade Math
Clay Central-Everyly CSD	85.37	85.37	80.88	85.29
Clayton Ridge CSD	69.62	81.01	68.60	74.42
Clear Creek Amana CSD	82.23	83.76	77.31	80.56
Clear Lake CSD	79.47	78.95	75.59	77.93
Clearfield CSD	50.00	70.00	to Diagonal, Lenox, Mt. Ayr	
Clinton CSD	76.61	81.12	67.62	71.45
Colfax-Mingo CSD	71.84	74.76	62.59	61.15
College CSD	88.58	90.32	78.47	83.68
Collins-Maxwell CSD	73.85	73.85	66.67	91.67
Colo-Nesco CSD	76.47	83.82	68.75	64.06
Columbus CSD	72.41	73.28	57.14	55.84
Coon Rapids-Bayard CSD	79.31	86.21	67.57	58.11
Corning CSD	70.18	87.72	79.75	88.61
Corwith-Wesley CSD	72.00	80.00	to LuVerne	
Council Bluffs CSD	71.33	74.48	64.87	67.56
Creston CSD	78.00	76.88	66.83	71.07
Dallas Center-Grimes CSD	88.33	92.61	85.59	80.18
Danville CSD	84.04	84.04	74.16	77.53
Davenport CSD	71.86	77.60	61.66	63.56
Davis County CSD	77.42	74.73	81.32	82.42
Decorah CSD	90.55	91.54	88.68	91.04
Deep River-Millersburg CSD	83.33	83.33	to English Valleys, Montezuma	
Delwood CSD	81.82	81.82	to Maquoketa	
Denison CSD	62.21	68.18	59.01	66.97
Denver CSD	90.11	93.41	77.50	87.50
Des Moines Independent CSD	63.56	68.44	55.60	59.73
Diagonal CSD	88.24	88.24	72.73	90.91
Dike-New Hartford CSD	90.10	89.11	77.88	91.15
Dows CSD	78.57	85.71	to Clarion-Goldfield	
Dubuque CSD	77.11	80.59	70.55	74.94
Dunkerton CSD	83.61	90.16	72.46	72.46
Durant CSD	73.86	75.00	78.10	72.26
Eagle Grove CSD	83.49	79.82	78.45	70.69
Earlham CSD	70.00	75.56	75.24	77.36
East Buchanan CSD	82.19	89.04	69.01	74.65
East Central CSD	85.19	85.19	71.67	76.27
East Greene CSD	68.42	68.42	64.29	57.14
East Marshall CSD	89.22	82.18	75.89	82.14
East Union CSD	70.18	80.70	73.53	76.81
Eastern Allamakee CSD	72.73	77.27	73.33	86.67
Eddyville-Blakesburg CSD	74.65	74.65	75.86	77.01
Edgewood-Colesburg CSD	75.90	79.27	78.64	81.55
Eldora-New Providence CSD	82.72	83.95	to Hubbard-Radcliffe	
Elk Horn-Kimballton CSD	91.18	91.18	77.50	87.50
Emmetsburg CSD	77.11	77.11	81.61	82.76
English Valleys CSD	72.31	84.62	68.67	77.11



<b>Agency</b>	<b>4th Grade Reading</b>	<b>4th Grade Math</b>	<b>8th Grade Reading</b>	<b>8th Grade Math</b>
Essex CSD	70.21	68.09	58.33	47.22
Estherville Lincoln Central CSD	76.61	73.26	67.20	70.21
Exira CSD	73.53	79.41	79.41	73.53
Fairfield CSD	78.60	81.66	79.13	86.22
Farragut CSD	90.91	86.36	62.22	60.00
Forest City CSD	80.72	81.93	76.29	81.73
Fort Dodge CSD	68.74	72.09	62.57	68.21
Fort Madison CSD	84.51	85.57	72.88	82.31
Fredericksburg CSD	76.74	93.02	77.61	89.47
Fremont CSD	75.00	83.33	61.54	73.08
Fremont-Mills CSD	69.09	67.27	68.66	73.13
Galva-Holstein CSD	94.29	91.43	84.62	87.69
Garner-Hayfield CSD	85.60	88.80	72.14	74.29
George-Little Rock CSD	86.36	75.76	71.23	69.86
Gilbert CSD	93.55	90.26	88.28	88.28
Gilmore City-Bradgate CSD	76.60	74.47	80.00	75.00
Gladbrook-Reinbeck CSD	80.61	85.71	77.05	79.51
Glenwood CSD	85.07	86.81	78.66	75.80
Glidden-Ralston CSD	80.00	82.00	80.00	74.29
GMG CSD	81.13	84.91	80.00	85.71
Graettinger CSD	84.62	87.18	to Terril	
Greene CSD	92.86	90.48	To Allison-Bristow	
Grinnell-Newburg CSD	92.07	89.47	71.54	80.89
Griswold CSD	94.67	97.33	67.33	66.34
Grundy Center CSD	81.71	82.72	82.98	83.87
Guthrie Center CSD	84.06	78.26	86.02	82.80
Hamburg CSD	60.61	69.70	71.43	62.86
Hampton-Dumont CSD	80.59	78.24	65.96	63.64
Harlan CSD	86.70	82.98	81.40	83.72
Harmony CSD	80.77	67.31	73.47	77.55
Harris-Lake Park CSD	93.75	100.00	88.89	94.44
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn CSD	85.71	85.71	76.47	78.00
Highland CSD	69.31	72.28	54.55	62.50
Hinton CSD	71.43	80.22	84.38	89.58
H-L-V CSD	82.61	84.78	72.73	84.85
Howard-Winneshiek CSD	81.76	87.34	73.85	78.44
Hubbard-Radcliffe CSD	72.22	94.44	71.95	65.85
Hudson CSD	80.81	88.89	81.34	82.84
Humboldt CSD	85.71	84.52	71.00	78.50
IKM CSD	76.79	75.00	78.72	82.98
Independence CSD	84.18	83.52	72.28	75.25
Indianola CSD	88.28	88.29	82.81	87.50
Interstate 35 CSD	76.27	82.20	76.42	75.61
Iowa City CSD	77.17	75.62	75.29	77.83
Iowa Falls CSD	83.92	89.51	75.74	77.51
Iowa Valley CSD	81.93	84.34	60.67	78.65

<b>Agency</b>	<b>4th Grade Reading</b>	<b>4th Grade Math</b>	<b>8th Grade Reading</b>	<b>8th Grade Math</b>
Janesville Consolidated Sch Dist	79.41	82.35	82.00	98.00
Jefferson-Scranton CSD	84.51	88.03	82.14	80.36
Jesup CSD	71.88	75.00	73.19	78.10
Johnston CSD	90.75	91.25	83.77	88.79
Keokuk CSD	76.47	75.65	60.96	59.16
Keota CSD	90.24	95.12	84.21	91.23
Kingsley-Pierson CSD	80.28	71.83	78.33	90.00
Knoxville CSD	80.75	86.74	69.40	77.29
Lake Mills CSD	76.77	68.69	71.43	74.04
Lamoni CSD	87.23	87.23	66.67	84.44
Laurens-Marathon CSD	60.42	72.92	73.44	76.56
Lawton-Bronson CSD	91.01	85.39	84.82	82.14
Le Mars CSD	80.98	80.67	73.65	84.76
Lenox CSD	75.00	77.27	68.00	70.00
Lewis Central CSD	67.72	71.88	69.62	72.08
Lineville-Clio CSD	Small N	Small N	63.64	45.45
Linn-Mar CSD	87.28	88.78	81.10	84.73
Lisbon CSD	71.91	77.53	74.42	86.05
Logan-Magnolia CSD	90.48	89.29	72.07	76.58
Lone Tree CSD	81.82	84.62	77.55	69.39
Louisa-Muscatine CSD	68.00	79.84	60.71	60.43
LuVerne CSD	to Corwith-Wesley		81.82	96.97
Lynnvile-Sully CSD	85.96	78.95	82.05	96.15
Madrid CSD	76.14	81.82	76.92	80.22
Malvern CSD	80.00	75.56	to Nishna Valley	
Manning CSD	85.71	85.71	78.13	87.50
Manson Northwest Webster CSD	82.05	84.62	85.29	87.25
Maple Valley CSD	76.36	74.55	to Anthon-Oto	
Maquoketa CSD	79.21	82.49	64.04	68.80
Maquoketa Valley CSD	87.38	92.23	81.30	90.24
Marcus-Meriden-Cleghorn CSD	95.52	98.51	75.95	81.01
Marion Independent Sch Dist	82.13	84.03	72.98	84.74
Marshalltown CSD	67.48	69.43	63.85	69.14
Martensdale-St Marys CSD	73.97	83.56	77.03	83.78
Mason City CSD	77.30	78.99	72.79	74.52
Mediapolis CSD	82.50	95.00	82.89	88.16
Melcher-Dallas CSD	80.95	78.57	59.65	68.42
MFL MarMac CSD	78.51	81.51	73.68	72.93
Midland CSD	90.48	87.30	68.06	83.33
Mid-Prairie CSD	77.64	77.36	75.38	82.05
Missouri Valley CSD	70.37	68.52	69.77	70.54
MOC-Floyd Valley CSD	96.95	95.12	82.67	87.62
Montezuma CSD	88.68	86.79	73.33	77.22
Monticello CSD	86.51	87.30	74.74	81.58
Moravia CSD	80.49	92.68	83.67	81.63
Mormon Trail CSD	58.82	61.76	72.97	75.68

Agency	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	8th Grade Reading	8th Grade Math
Morning Sun CSD	93.75	93.75	to Wapello, Winfield Mt. Union, Mediapolis	
Moulton-Udell CSD	90.63	93.75	62.16	62.16
Mount Ayr CSD	90.36	91.57	70.59	82.18
Mount Pleasant CSD	84.00	80.67	73.83	71.81
Mount Vernon CSD	93.41	91.62	81.87	83.63
Murray CSD	80.56	88.89	69.57	78.26
Muscatine CSD	87.78	89.56	73.44	77.62
Nashua-Plainfield CSD	81.73	87.50	74.19	83.06
Nevada CSD	79.47	81.05	80.00	82.44
New Hampton CSD	79.07	79.07	70.39	75.66
New London CSD	77.92	71.43	67.07	70.73
New Market CSD	85.71	92.86	to Clarinda, Bedford	
Newell-Fonda CSD	78.79	81.82	83.82	85.29
Newton CSD	78.61	79.16	70.98	69.71
Nishna Valley CSD	71.43	64.29	69.39	67.35
Nodaway Valley CSD	70.10	74.23	72.81	81.58
Nora Springs-Rock Falls CSD	80.00	80.00	74.79	82.35
North Cedar CSD	78.51	86.78	83.21	90.51
North Central CSD	83.56	90.41	to Nora Springs-Rock Falls	
North Fayette CSD	92.17	86.09	75.14	73.26
North Iowa CSD	72.73	69.70	61.64	64.38
North Kossuth CSD	57.14	71.43	82.05	82.05
North Linn CSD	84.69	89.80	70.49	79.51
North Mahaska CSD	81.16	84.06	74.07	77.22
North Polk CSD	85.16	90.32	81.70	87.58
North Scott CSD	85.88	91.06	80.84	80.65
North Tama County CSD	80.90	93.26	70.83	79.17
North Winneshiek CSD	71.05	83.78	62.50	87.50
Northeast CSD	86.52	94.38	85.87	90.11
Northeast Hamilton CSD	91.89	89.19	76.74	90.70
Northwood-Kensett CSD	73.77	77.05	79.22	87.01
Norwalk CSD	78.51	82.86	82.04	82.63
Odebolt-Arthur CSD	89.19	89.19	89.74	87.18
Oelwein CSD	78.57	83.12	73.71	80.41
Ogden CSD	90.11	93.41	76.61	79.84
Okoboji CSD	92.17	93.04	74.80	79.53
Olin Consolidated Sch Dist	83.33	91.67	58.33	68.57
Orient-Macksburg CSD	75.00	75.00	68.42	68.42
Osage CSD	75.21	70.00	77.71	86.14
Oskaloosa CSD	81.70	87.91	68.07	70.87
Ottumwa CSD	72.74	74.75	67.82	70.25
Panorama CSD	85.60	88.00	78.18	78.18
Paton-Churdan CSD	81.82	81.82	61.90	66.67
PCM CSD	79.02	74.13	73.01	79.27
Pekin CSD	88.78	85.71	65.45	70.00
Pella CSD	89.18	92.79	86.65	89.10

Agency	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	8th Grade Reading	8th Grade Math
Perry CSD	84.65	78.75	60.83	68.05
Pleasant Valley CSD	86.71	90.54	76.67	85.99
Pleasantville CSD	86.75	84.34	74.76	82.52
Pocahontas Area CSD	76.47	90.20	81.25	88.75
Pomeroy-Palmer CSD	66.67	69.70	69.57	86.96
Postville CSD	58.97	75.32	77.46	76.06
Prairie Valley CSD	90.63	91.67	75.00	75.89
Prescott CSD	Small N	Small N	to Orient-Macksburg, Corning	
Preston CSD	80.70	89.47	86.54	86.00
Red Oak CSD	72.92	72.92	69.48	68.83
Remsen-Union CSD	73.47	87.76	76.92	80.77
Riceville CSD	72.34	85.11	81.82	87.27
River Valley CSD	91.67	100.00	80.60	79.10
Riverside CSD	88.51	87.36	79.22	84.42
Rock Valley CSD	78.30	84.62	66.67	77.78
Rockwell City-Lytton CSD	85.71	90.48	80.26	86.84
Rockwell-Swaledale CSD	82.93	90.24	60.00	72.31
Roland-Story CSD	90.15	88.64	80.29	86.13
Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rk CSD	84.29	88.57	73.17	74.39
Russell CSD	Small N	Small N	61.90	55.00
Ruthven-Ayrshire CSD	70.59	70.59	52.78	63.89
Sac CSD	76.47	67.65	70.30	80.20
Saydel CSD	69.40	74.86	66.18	68.60
Schaller-Crestland CSD	84.48	84.48	77.59	84.48
Schleswig CSD	93.62	93.62	84.85	93.94
Sentral CSD	95.83	83.33	64.29	71.43
Sergeant Bluff-Luton CSD	89.64	87.56	77.40	78.85
Seymour CSD	73.08	61.54	65.63	71.88
Sheffield Chapin Meservey Thornton CSD	81.25	93.75	70.15	79.10
Sheldon CSD	82.50	82.50	72.46	90.58
Shenandoah CSD	77.33	71.33	67.33	64.00
Sibley-Ocheyedan CSD	77.12	76.92	80.71	83.57
Sidney CSD	72.92	83.33	62.75	80.39
Sigourney CSD	75.61	85.19	71.74	71.74
Sioux Center CSD	86.33	89.86	77.46	85.92
Sioux Central CSD	80.77	76.92	76.42	73.58
Sioux City CSD	68.50	71.55	62.93	63.62
Solon CSD	86.56	86.56	78.74	82.18
South Clay CSD	83.33	77.78	to Ruthven-Ayrshire, Sioux Central, Spencer	
South Hamilton CSD	80.65	82.80	78.76	84.07
South O'Brien CSD	86.25	91.25	76.47	83.53
South Page CSD	80.00	68.00	66.67	62.50
South Tama County CSD	67.16	66.17	74.30	74.30
South Winneshiek CSD	86.57	92.54	70.89	75.95
Southeast Polk CSD	82.97	84.78	76.02	77.89

<b>Agency</b>	<b>4th Grade Reading</b>	<b>4th Grade Math</b>	<b>8th Grade Reading</b>	<b>8th Grade Math</b>
Southeast Warren CSD	81.03	87.93	82.19	84.93
Southeast Webster Grand CSD	79.17	81.94	65.52	66.67
Southern Cal CSD	83.10	88.73	63.10	76.19
Spencer CSD	76.50	78.02	74.07	75.76
Spirit Lake CSD	86.98	86.91	80.79	76.84
Springville CSD	83.05	79.66	65.08	68.25
St Ansgar CSD	76.29	80.41	65.59	77.42
Stanton CSD	96.55	96.55	76.60	76.60
Starmont CSD	87.36	89.66	77.36	86.79
Storm Lake CSD	68.72	61.07	56.90	61.38
Stratford CSD	86.96	86.96	to Webster City	
Sumner CSD	79.49	85.90	to Fredericksburg	
Terril CSD	to Graettinger		82.69	80.77
Tipton CSD	82.46	84.96	82.05	87.18
Titonka Consolidated Sch Dist	76.92	84.62	67.27	70.91
Treynor CSD	86.79	83.02	92.22	91.11
Tri-Center CSD	79.35	80.43	72.32	77.68
Tri-County CSD	78.38	81.08	64.71	74.51
Tripoli CSD	82.89	82.89	71.91	79.78
Turkey Valley CSD	91.38	86.21	68.22	82.24
Twin Cedars CSD	70.97	69.35	68.67	74.70
Underwood CSD	86.49	83.78	78.79	84.85
Union CSD	81.82	80.11	89.01	84.29
United CSD	94.59	89.19	to Boone	
Urbandale CSD	83.86	85.74	85.80	90.60
Valley CSD	76.62	72.73	78.05	78.05
Van Buren CSD	90.91	89.77	69.11	71.54
Van Meter CSD	92.47	91.40	84.78	80.43
Ventura CSD	93.02	90.70	79.59	83.67
Villisca CSD	68.09	82.98	58.93	78.57
Vinton-Shellsburg CSD	80.62	80.97	71.54	80.15
Waco CSD	81.67	83.33	62.50	69.44
Wall Lake View Auburn CSD	74.65	76.06	to Sac	
Walnut CSD	77.14	77.14	58.97	58.97
Wapello CSD	87.27	85.45	67.59	75.93
Wapsie Valley CSD	75.00	76.19	72.28	78.22
Washington CSD	74.55	79.91	59.52	73.81
Waterloo CSD	64.60	66.05	56.89	57.12
Waukee CSD	89.51	89.02	85.74	83.22
Waverly-Shell Rock CSD	93.15	92.24	82.89	87.50
Wayne CSD	85.71	80.95	83.51	82.29
Webster City CSD	83.41	85.37	75.88	85.60
West Bend-Mallard CSD	88.10	85.71	84.21	89.47
West Branch CSD	90.72	85.57	70.64	77.06
West Burlington Ind Sch Dist	70.93	58.14	77.55	70.41
West Central CSD	77.27	84.09	81.82	84.09

Agency	4th Grade Reading	4th Grade Math	8th Grade Reading	8th Grade Math
West Central Valley CSD	76.42	86.99	71.67	67.50
West Delaware County CSD	77.06	80.00	78.44	82.96
West Des Moines CSD	85.84	86.17	81.73	87.21
West Hancock CSD	74.44	71.43	65.69	75.49
West Harrison CSD	82.54	84.13	64.29	57.14
West Liberty CSD	62.60	65.65	60.84	81.12
West Lyon CSD	87.21	90.59	76.42	89.62
West Marshall CSD	87.10	90.32	79.10	84.33
West Monona CSD	62.11	58.95	63.37	70.30
West Sioux CSD	75.00	77.17	67.82	70.11
Western Dubuque CSD	83.06	82.68	79.77	82.95
Westwood CSD	81.43	82.86	55.24	66.35
Whiting CSD	93.10	89.66	79.41	85.29
Williamsburg CSD	91.13	88.71	80.36	80.36
Wilton CSD	78.57	76.79	75.74	75.74
Winfield-Mt Union CSD	71.43	75.00	80.28	76.06
Winterset CSD	80.78	76.38	85.59	73.73
Woden-Crystal Lake CSD	45.45	54.55	to Titonka	
Woodbine CSD	92.86	80.95	67.80	79.31
Woodbury Central CSD	83.72	81.18	81.11	82.22
Woodward-Granger CSD	78.13	79.17	79.31	86.21

## Evaluator Training Program and Changes and Improvements in the Evaluation of Teachers Under the Iowa Teaching Standards

### Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program (IEATP)

During the 2002 legislative session, IEATP was mandated for any educator who wanted to obtain the new evaluator license and renew their administrative endorsement and the corresponding general administrative endorsement. The materials and training for IEATP were developed by area education agencies (AEAs), School Administrators of Iowa (SAI), the University of Northern Iowa (UNI), and the Southeast Regional Laboratory (SERVE) in cooperation with DE personnel. A statewide application process for potential trainers was implemented and 65 trainers were selected. Training began in the fall of 2002 and was delivered in five regions across the state. Over 2,300 participants were trained by June 2006.

Beginning in the summer of 2007, the training is being offered through the professional development office of each AEA. Trainers continue to be certified by the state of Iowa and ongoing support for the training comes from the DE. Higher education institutions that offer approved administrator preparation programs have integrated this new evaluator training into their pre-service school administration programs. In the fall of 2008, the DE and SAI began the development of an online Level I Evaluator Training Program for experienced administrators new to Iowa. SAI will host the online training site beginning in December 2008.

As a result of the 2002 legislative requirement, the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria became the statewide expectation for all teachers. The DE has developed and shared a model evaluation process and the summative evaluation instrument to be used at the culmination of the comprehensive performance review <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/538/563/>. Dr. Tom McGreal collaborated with the DE in the development of the evaluation model. The evaluator training program outlined above includes these statewide models as part of the training materials.

### **Evaluator Approval Renewal Training**

The content for the two renewal courses: *The Iowa Evaluator Approval Renewal Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* and *The Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* was developed by collaborative work with the DE, SAI, and AEAs. Evaluator Approval Renewal trainings were designed to focus on the evaluation of teachers using the Iowa Teaching Standards and the evaluation of administrators using the Iowa Standards for School Leaders. Trainers were trained during the spring of 2007. These two renewal courses are offered through the AEAs. The costs of the renewal training are paid for through registration fees.

*The Iowa Evaluator Approval Renewal Training (IEART) Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* is designed for principals and other educational leaders who are responsible for the evaluation of teachers' skill attainment and enhancement. The areas covered in the training are:

- effective leadership practices in evaluation;
- knowledge and understanding of best practice in writing an individual career development plan;
- knowledge and understanding of best practice in writing an intensive assistance plan;
- skills in the use of effective strategies for formative conferencing; and
- skills in the use of coaching strategies.

Seventy-six trainers were certified to teach this course. Twenty-eight of these trainers delivered the training to administrators in their home district. This provided a valuable opportunity for the districts to incorporate their training with the district's local evaluation process and procedures. Initial feedback indicates that ongoing professional conversations around evaluation of teachers continue in the districts with their in-house trainer. Five higher education professors and the executive director of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (BoEE), also received this training to provide knowledge to enhance their work with Iowa administrators.

*The Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* is designed for superintendents and other educational leaders responsible for the evaluation of administrators' skill attainment and enhancement. The areas covered include:

- the application of the Iowa Standards for School Leaders;
- recognition of effective principal behaviors that increase student achievement, including use of data, alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and first- and second-order change;
- research and the application of effective superintendent behaviors that increase student achievement;
- coaching skills to enhance principals' skills as instructional leaders; and
- models of principal evaluation processes, including design and the use of an individual career development plan for principals.

Fifty trainers were trained to teach the renewal course to evaluate administrators. Eleven higher education professors and the executive director of the BoEE took part in the training to enhance their knowledge as they work with future and current Iowa administrators.

Participants took part in the first two modules September 19, 2007, when Dr. Douglas Reeves addressed the participants, followed in the afternoon by an emphasis on the Iowa Standards for School Leaders. All remaining modules take place in each AEA on the dates of the superintendents' meetings. Trainers work in pairs. Each training pair is an AEA administrator and a practicing or retired superintendent.

Iowa law currently requires that an administrator complete either *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* OR *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* for renewal. Individuals may choose to take both to complete their required four hours for license and evaluator renewal. Administrators have been encouraged to take the course most pertinent in his/her current job description. During the 2007-2008 school year, 1167 administrators completed the IEART Program II: Evaluation of Teachers and 455 administrators completed the IEART Program II: Evaluation of Administrators.

## **Evaluation Model**

The DE, in collaboration with Dr. Tom McGreal, developed a model for a local evaluation system. This model was made available to the public in August 2002 at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/538/563/>. This document provides local Iowa school districts with a basic evaluation model that can be used to shape a standards-based teacher evaluation system that will meet all the expectations of the Iowa teacher quality program. This model encourages a range of sources of data and information to document that teachers meet the Iowa Teaching Standards. The model also incorporates the requirements for evaluation that are included in the teacher quality legislation.

## **Model Descriptors**

The DE worked with a cadre of educational experts led by Dr. Vickie Trent, UNI; Dr. Charlotte Danielson, Outcomes Associates; Dr. Tom McGreal, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois; Dr. Beverly Showers, Staff Development Consultant; and Dr. Barbara Howard, SERVE; to develop model descriptors to support the criteria for the Iowa Teaching Standards. These model descriptors are intended to help districts further define, in operational or behavioral terms, expectations under the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. These model descriptors can be located at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/542/565/>.

In June 2007, another set of model evidence (descriptors) was added at the above website. This set of evidence illustrates how a single piece of evidence can support several different Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

## **Comprehensive Evaluation Instrument**

The DE worked with legal representatives from SAI, Iowa State Education Association (ISEA), and the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) on the development of the summative Comprehensive Evaluation Instrument for second year teachers. This instrument is a mandated part of a local evaluation system that is required for use in the final evaluation of second year teachers. This instrument was included in the Evaluation Model issued by the DE and in IEATP training materials for participants in evaluator approval training.

## **District Evaluation Design**

Beginning July 1, 2005, all districts were required to base their evaluation of all teachers on the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. All career teachers will be evaluated a minimum of every three years and they will annually develop and implement an individual career plan focused on the district's and building's student learning priorities and the district's staff development plan. They must also provide an intensive assistance component designed to support teachers not meeting one or more of the teaching standards. As a support for this work, the DE, in cooperation with the AEAs, conducted a statewide series of ICN sessions focused on teacher evaluation systems providing information and local school examples that have already been developed. The AEAs also have at least one consultant who serves as a liaison to districts as a person who can provide information resources and possible technical support for the district's design effort.

The DE continues to provide support to the current evaluation design and staff development model by providing samples of district and building level professional development plans, individual career development plans, and samples of completed career teacher evaluations as support to the work of local districts and various professional organizations in order to illustrate how these components all connect with one another.

## **2007 Legislative Actions**

In an effort to continue the state's focus on teacher quality, the Iowa Legislature added several components which enhances the educator quality bill

- Funding for professional development
- Attendance Center Professional Development Plans
- Teacher Quality Committee responsibilities
- Expansion of administrator quality
  - The expansion of administrator quality creates a new Iowa Code Chapter 284A that mirrors the policy included in the teacher quality program. This expansion builds on the new administrator mentoring and induction enacted in 2006 to include statewide Standards for School Leaders, administrator professional development plans, and standards-based administrator evaluations.



## **The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program**

Every new educator enters into a two-year induction program that addresses the educator's personal and professional needs and trains him or her on Iowa's eight teaching standards. A mentor is assigned to each educator – not to evaluate for employment purposes, but to observe, critique, and provide support and advice on effective teaching practices. In 2007, school psychologists, nurses, social workers, and speech and language pathologists with a teaching license who are new to the profession were approved to participate in the mentoring and induction program.

Mentors must have at least four years of teaching experience and demonstrated skills in classroom training and coaching. They receive training on district expectations, based on Iowa's eight teaching standards. Mentoring programs can be designed by the district or the AEA, which provide school improvement services for the local education community. The mentor must follow this program while focusing on the educator's individual needs. One hundred percent of the public school districts and all AEAs in Iowa have a mentoring and induction plan that has been approved by the DE.

After the two-year induction program, the new educator receives a standard license in most cases. The state fully funds induction for the required two years. If an educator does not meet the requirements after the two years, a third year in the induction program can be granted by the district, but must be funded by the district. If the educator does not successfully complete the program after the third year, that educator cannot receive a license and cannot continue to teach in the state.

During the 2007-08 school year, 3,614 new educators participated in the state-funded Iowa Mentoring and Induction program. This total is comprised of both first and second year educators in local education agencies (LEAs) and AEAs statewide.

### **Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute**

The fourth annual statewide Mentoring and Induction Institute was held in Cedar Falls, Iowa, June 18-20, 2008. Co-sponsors with the Department of Education included the University of Northern Iowa and the Iowa State Education Association. The Institute addressed effective practices to support beginning educators from the pre-service experience to the classroom. Dr. Tyrone Howard, Associate Professor of Urban Schooling, UCLA, Los Angeles, addressed the 2008 Mentoring and Induction Institute as keynote speaker. He presented his research topics on multicultural education and the social and political context of schools with a focus on the preparation and the successful induction of new teachers in a diverse learning environment. Dr. Marcia Tate, an independent education consultant, presented a full-day workshop entitled, "Worksheets Don't Grow Dendrites: 20 Instructional Strategies that Engage the Brain" Participants learned 20 research-based instructional strategies to use in the classroom. The strategies were intended to increase learning for students with strategies like drawing, metaphor, music, and storytelling used to teach curriculum objectives and meet teaching standards.

The Mentoring and Induction Institute conferred the annual Mildred Middleton Crystal Key Awards for Outstanding Mentoring and for Outstanding Leadership in a Mentoring and Induction Program. The awards were provided by ISEA and presented by ISEA President, Linda Nelson.

### **The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Network**

The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Network is primarily comprised of AEA staff who administer the program in their areas and is led by the department administrator of the Iowa Mentoring and Induction program, DE. The network meets semi-annually in the Des Moines area. The full-day network meetings provide information and technical assistance to AEAs and others in attendance on such topics as licensure issues for new educators, system support, Iowa mentoring and induction models, and mentoring resources.

### **Mentoring and Induction Statewide (MITS) Steering Committee**

This committee (MITS) meets several times a year and is comprised of representatives of the Iowa Department of Education (DE), AEAs, higher education, local school districts, and ISEA. The MITS Committee gives guidance and direction to the DE on program issues and plans and coordinates the annual Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute. The steering committee networked with experts in the field of mentoring and induction by attending the New

Teacher Center Symposium in San Jose, California, in February 2008. The symposium, sponsored by the University of California, Santa Cruz, is attended by over 3,000 educators from the United States and several countries from around the world. Resources and information acquired at the symposium were used to enhance the quality of the Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program.

### **Survey on New Teachers in Iowa**

The Iowa Department of Education contracted with the Research Division of the New Teacher Center (NYC) at the University of California, Santa Cruz, to survey beginning educators, mentors, and site administrators about teacher preparation and induction programs in Iowa. Surveys were sent in the spring and results were reported to the state, preparing institutions, and area education agencies in September, 2008. The results included aggregated data for the entire state as well as disaggregated data by preparing institution and area education agencies. These data provided feedback which the state, preparing institutions, and area education agencies are using for program improvement.

### **Mentoring and Induction Model**

The Iowa Department of Education program administrator of Iowa's Mentoring and Induction Program co-chaired with ISEA an effort that resulted in a model for districts and AEAs to follow in developing a high quality mentoring and induction program at the local and regional levels. During the 2007-2008 school year, districts in AEA 13 piloted *Journey to Excellence: Iowa Training Model for Mentors of Beginning Educators*.

*Journey to Excellence* is designed to prepare and support mentors as they assist beginning teachers' transition from the university to classroom practice. Six days of training are held over two years for the mentor, four days the first year and two days the second year. In addition, the mentor and beginning educator attend one day in August, the Introduction to *Journey to Excellence*.

Using best teaching practices, mentors are trained for their role of supporting and guiding beginning teachers. Interactive and in-depth, the training also offers opportunities for mentors to reflect on their own practice as they provide guidance to beginning teachers. Mentors leave with a set of materials and skills designed to effectively structure conversations about teaching practice related to the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

The advantages of aligning with the new statewide Induction program, *Journey to Excellence* include:

- Meeting all the requirements of the legislation and Iowa Code.
- Having a primary focus of the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria
- Anticipated costs are reduced within local printing (at the AEA) and a minimum fee for text(s).
- Paperwork is reduced.

### **Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant (TQE)**

In 2005, the Iowa Department of Education was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education in the amount of \$6.3 million dollars over three years. This grant is being used to increase the effectiveness of teacher education programs and in 2008 supported the collection of data on first and second year teachers in Iowa and funded various activities of the statewide program for new educators. In the development of the grant application, the funds appropriated for the Iowa Mentoring and Induction program during FY 2005 were used to leverage the federal TQE funds. Funds from the TQE grant are used to support various mentoring and induction technical assistance activities that benefit LEAs and AEAs.

### **New Teacher Retention in Iowa, 2007-2008**

The number of new professionals in 2007-2008, defined as those in their first and second years of teaching, increased over those teaching in 2006-2007. Since Iowa's Teacher Quality legislation was enacted in 2001, the retention rate of new teachers in Iowa, has increased from 86.4% (2001-2002 school year) to 91.3% (2007-2008 school year). The following chart illustrates the increase in teachers over time:

## Iowa First Year Teacher Retention 1996-1997 to 2007-2008

Source: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation  
Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS), Staff Files

Note: Count of teachers in base year includes new teachers in public schools, AEAs, and non-public schools.  
Count of teachers still teaching in years following includes teachers teaching anywhere in the state (public schools, AEA, non-public schools).

Base School Year	Number First Year Teacher Base School Year	Still Teaching in 2001-2002	Percent Still Teaching in 2001-2002	Still Teaching in 2002-2003	Percent Still Teaching in 2002-2003	Still Teaching in 2003-2004	Percent Still Teaching in 2003-2004	Still Teaching in 2004-2005	Percent Still Teaching in 2004-2005	Still Teaching in 2005-2006	Percent Still Teaching in 2005-2006	Still Teaching in 2006-2007	Percent Still Teaching in 2006-2007	Still Teaching in 2007-2008	Percent Still Teaching in 2007-2008
1996-1997	1412	897	63.5%	854	60.5%	824	58.4%	790	55.9%	762	54.0%	741	52.5%	712	50.4%
1997-1998	1556	1071	68.8%	1031	66.3%	970	62.3%	929	59.7%	902	58.0%	879	56.5%	847	54.4%
1998-1999	1620	1196	73.8%	1147	70.8%	1105	68.2%	1048	64.7%	987	60.9%	973	60.1%	950	58.6%
1999-2000	2147	1730	80.6%	1606	74.8%	1521	70.8%	1438	67.0%	1378	64.2%	1338	62.3%	1305	60.8%
2000-2001	2090	1806	86.4%	1613	77.2%	1509	72.2%	1426	68.2%	1362	65.2%	1320	63.2%	1264	60.5%
2001-2002	1811			1579	87.2%	1429	78.9%	1342	74.1%	1279	70.6%	1208	66.7%	1169	64.5%
2002-2003	1457					1291	88.6%	1156	79.3%	1080	74.1%	1024	70.3%	967	66.4%
2003-2004	1604							1443	90.0%	1329	82.9%	1254	78.2%	1182	73.7%
2004-2005	1662									1523	91.6%	1382	83.2%	1297	78.0%
2005-2006	1751											1590	90.8%	1455	83.1%
2006-2007	1842													1681	91.3%
2007-2008	1933														

## Professional Development

### Priorities:

**The DE's efforts during 2007-08 to improve the professional development systems have emphasized the following priorities:**

1. Developing the capacity of school leaders and AEA personnel in Iowa to lead and support professional development at the district and building level.
2. Assisting local districts in accessing research-based instructional content through the Iowa Teacher Academies.
3. Providing technical assistance to implement the new requirements of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act (2007)
4. Providing resources to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum

### Actions:

**Priority 1: Developing the capacity of school leaders and AEA personnel in Iowa to lead and support professional development at the district and building level.**

The DE delivered several learning opportunities and technical assistance events to help educators learn how to lead quality professional development at the district and building level. Participants included superintendents, principals, central office administrators, professional development leadership team members, college and university representatives, and AEA staff. Capacity building efforts focused on the leadership actions needed to direct school improvement initiatives and implement professional development focused on accomplishing gains in student achievement. Examples:

- On-going technical assistance meetings with Iowa Urban 8 Professional Development Consultants – meetings were held throughout the year to address professional development needs of Iowa's largest school districts.
- AEA Chief Administrators, DE consultants, and a LEA superintendent from each AEA engaged with Dr. Richard Elmore and a team from the Harvard School of Education to build the capacity of school leaders to build and sustain the district school improvement efforts with the support of a network of various school leaders.
- Winter Institute: (*February 19, 2008, West Des Moines; February 20, 2008, Coralville; February 21, 2008, Storm Lake*) Content emphasized new professional development requirements and an introduction to the Iowa Core Curriculum. The target audience included local district teacher quality committees, professional development leadership teams, school administrators, and AEA consultants who support local district professional development and school improvement.
- On August 5<sup>th</sup>, facilitated an SAI session on Professional Development by Thomas Guskey. The Iowa Superintendent's Finance and Leadership Consortium met on December 19, 2007. The target audience included superintendents and other school leaders. Content included Supporting the Teacher Quality Committees and the Iowa Professional Development Model.

In addition to training events, the DE provided technical assistance and on-going support to the development of a statewide coordinated system of administrator development for student achievement. Iowa Department of Education personnel contributed to the Iowa Leadership Academy Design Team as this group formed a comprehensive approach to preparing school leaders. An example of the outcomes of this group's efforts includes The Iowa Leadership Academy held on June 23-26, 2008. It provided professional development for school principals that focused on leadership skills for leading professional development and other school improvement roles.

A specialist in research and data analysis has analyzed instructional strategies and additional content specific research and prepared summaries of the impact of instructional strategies pertinent to each content area. The summaries and research sources including additional publications to support the work in each content area will be added to the Iowa Content Network webpage soon. This synthesis of the research will be of benefit to

administrators and teachers that analyze student data and are responsible for selecting research-based instructional strategies to enhance student achievement. The Iowa Professional Development Content Network is posted on the DE website at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/prodev/main.html>

## **Priority 2: Assisting local districts in accessing research-based instructional content through the Iowa Teacher Development Academies (ITDA)**

### **Iowa Teacher Development Academies**

Over the past three school years, Iowa's districts have had the opportunity to participate in ITDAs aimed at increasing teacher skills and student achievement. The ITDAs feature research-based content and are designed to support local school districts and AEAs in offering professional development based on the Iowa Professional Development Model. The six academies include:

- **Authentic Intellectual Work (AIW)** : This is an instructional approach that emphasizes cognitive complexity, or teacher for understanding. AIW is characterized by construction of knowledge through the use of disciplined inquiry, to produce discourse, products, or performances that have value beyond school. To date, 21 schools have participated in AIW.
- **Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI)**: A teacher professional development program based on over 20 years of research. This training is for elementary school teams. CGI is a framework for understanding how children learn the concepts of numbers, operations and algebra. These concepts are integrated into current mathematics instruction. To date, 24 elementary schools from 15 school districts have participated in CGI.
- **Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction**: This academy engages upper elementary and middle school teams in a research-based classroom instructional model emphasizing reading engagement, reading comprehension, and conceptual learning in science and other content areas in order to improve reading achievement. To date, teams from 12 schools representing eight school districts have participated in CORI.
- **Question-Answer Response**: This is a professional development opportunity for middle and high school teams who have targeted improved student performance for staff development. This academy focuses on a question and answer strategy intended to improve students' reading comprehension in the content areas. To date, 21 school teams from 19 school districts have participated in QAR.
- **Second Chance Reading**: This program provides a specific course for struggling readers at the middle and high school levels. To date, 96 schools from 56 school districts have participated in SCR. Second Chance Reading has continued to expand throughout Iowa. Beverly Showers, the developer of SCR and national expert in programming for struggling adolescent readers, has worked with consultants in Iowa for several years to create a system of trainer development for SCR that the DE now maintains. With the addition of this year's SCR trainees, Iowa will have 51 SCR trainers in the field to help middle school and high school teachers learn SCR, with ongoing technical assistance and support from the DE.
- **Strategic Instruction Model**: For the past three years, the DE has continued to build the state's capacity to support the SIM which originates from the Center for Research on Learning at the University of Kansas. The number of participants grew from 46 the first year to 76 at the end of 2007-2008. This group is comprised of members from each AEA, eight school districts, two private schools and one alternative high school. Participants are provided opportunities for professional development activities on a yearly basis. Each new participant is assigned a certified mentor to help guide and assist them through the training and certification process. The process for becoming a certified professional developer is quite stringent and takes most participants two to three years to finish their certification.

## **Priority 3: Providing technical assistance to implement the new requirements of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act (2007)**

**AEA Teacher and Administrator Quality Meeting:** March 10, 2008

The target audience included AEA teacher quality team members. The content included an overview of the Teacher and Administrator Quality Program requirements for AEAs including professional development, evaluation, mentoring and induction for administrators and AEA personnel, and the functions of the AEA teacher quality committees.

On-going technical assistance has been provided directly to AEAs and LEAs through the frequently asked question (FAQ) process, conference calls, and presentations as requested.

The Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM) Technical Guide has undergone a major revision and is now ready to distribute. The new IPDM Technical Guide includes guidance on legislative changes from the past year including requirements related to the teacher quality committees, the Iowa Core Curriculum and professional development plans. Many educational organizations and school leaders throughout the state have provided input to the final document. The Technical Guide is now in a final stage of graphic development and should be ready for publication on the DE website as well as distribution to appropriate stakeholders within the next 60 days.

#### **Priority 4: Providing resources to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum**

The IPDM provides the framework to assist AEAs and local districts as they design professional development to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum. This year the DE continuously developed and refined technical assistance and materials to implement the Iowa Core Curriculum following the Iowa Standards for Professional Development.

**AEA Leaders Conference:** June 12-13, 2008.

Target Audience: AEA administrators and consultants

Content: Overview of the Iowa Core Curriculum and leadership roles of the AEAs in the successful implementation of the Core Curriculum

**Iowa Core Curriculum Network:** July 28-29, August 18-19, September 25-26, November 20-21, 2008.

Target Audience: AEA Network. The Network is made up of practitioners who have been organized to deliver the training and facilitation needed by schools to conduct the following actions critical to the successful implementation of the Core Curriculum. This group of trainers/facilitators will play a collaborative role in helping school leaders establish a professional development plan for educators to improve their instructional practices that are aligned with the Core Curriculum.

Content: Leadership actions and support for the successful implementation of the Core Curriculum in all schools; practices and processes to ensure the successful implementation of Core Curriculum; and structures and tools to enable schools to put the Core Curriculum in place.

**Iowa Core Curriculum Leadership Series:** The Iowa Department of Education and Area Education Agencies along with representatives of SAI, Wallace Foundation and local school districts are designing support and technical assistance for local school leaders and leadership teams. The Iowa Core Curriculum Network Members are delivering these sessions across the state throughout the 08-09 school year.

Target Audience: District Leadership Teams

Content: 1) Leadership skills and knowledge to build and sustain a continuous improvement effort; 2) Build an understanding of the Iowa Core Curriculum. 3) Begin to develop an implementation plan that ensures the success of each and every student by providing a world-class curriculum.

# **Pay-for-Performance and Career Ladder Pilot Grants**

## **Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program**

Iowa Code 284.14

***Iowa Department of Education***  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

January 2009

State of Iowa  
**Department of Education**  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St  
Des Moines IA 50319-0146

## **State Board of Education**

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton  
Kameron Dodge, Student Member, Cambridge  
Vacant

### **Administration**

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

**Division of PK-12 Education**  
Kevin Fangman, Administrator

**Division of School Support and Information**  
James Addy, Administrator

**Bureau of Planning, Research, Development and Evaluation Services**  
James Pennington, Chief  
Dianne Chadwick, Administrative Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the *Iowa Code* sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688) Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St, Des Moines IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.



Iowa Department of Education  
Interim Report 2009  
As Required by Iowa Code 284.14  
Pay-for-Performance and Career Ladder Pilot Grants  
Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program

Legislation passed during the 2007 Iowa legislative session, provided additional funding for grants for districts to create a plan for an enhanced teacher compensation program including implementing a career ladder or pay-for-performance as part of the Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program, Iowa Code 284. Iowa Code 284 also requires the Iowa Department of Education (DE) to report on school district use of grant funds by January 15, 2009. The report is being made available to the chairpersons and ranking members of the senate and house committees on education, the General Assembly, the Legislative Services Agency, the State Board of Education, the Governor, and school districts.

The DE and the Pay-for-Performance Commission provided an opportunity for school districts to apply to receive funds to study and enhance teacher compensation through a pay-for-performance or a career ladder plan. The purpose of the pilot program is to provide funds to local school districts to research, study, develop, and implement pilots designed to identify promising practices related to enhanced teacher compensation career ladder models or pay-for-performance models. Senate File 277 allotted funding to the DE to initiate a pilot for districts to study, design, and implement a career ladder program. Senate File 277 also allotted funding to the Pay-for-Performance Commission to begin a pilot with districts to study, design, and implement a pay-for-performance plan.

Three districts applied and were accepted into the planning pilot (July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008) and, subsequently, the implementation pilot (July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009):

Cedar Rapids  
MOC-Floyd Valley  
Mt. Pleasant

While the membership of each team was a local decision, administrators and teachers including bargaining unit representatives were included. Each group reported spending many hours reviewing enhanced teacher pay plans from across the nation.

Representatives of the three districts met together on multiple occasions including:

December 2007	Anthony Milanowski, a research scientist from the University of Wisconsin, who has been studying teacher compensation for the past decade, discussed various career ladder and pay-for-performance options.
February 2008	Representatives heard multiple speakers on "Performance Incentives: Their Growing Impact on American K-12 Education" through Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
March 2008	Denver Pro-Comp Representative, Jeff Buck, discussed Denver's program to enhance teacher pay and improve student performance.
May 2008	Rob Meyer, a research scientist from the University of Wisconsin studying value added methods of evaluating schools and teachers, was invited to present, but cancelled at the last moment due to health concerns. His research paper was forwarded to the districts.

### *Implementation Plans*

The implementation plans of the three districts for the 2008-09 school year vary greatly and are summarized in this section.

#### **Cedar Rapids**

#### **Career ladder**

The Enrichment Specialist pilot program will develop leaders at the elementary schools and provide systemic change to the already existing programs at the middle and high school. Currently, there is a loosely monitored program of departmental chairs at the high school level and some team leadership roles at some of the middle schools. The programs lack definition and consistency.

At the elementary school level: Elementary schools (24) will be grouped into clusters of four, with the pilot program being able to initially serve only two clusters. Each cluster will hire, from existing staff, four Enrichment Specialists. The cost of the replacement teachers will be borne by the pilot program. The Enrichment Specialists will each receive an annual salary augmentation of \$5,000. The Enrichment Specialist team for each cluster will develop and deliver curriculum at each of the clustered elementary schools on an established schedule that will begin two weeks after the student year begins and end two weeks prior to the end of the student year. When the Enrichment Specialists are delivering curriculum at an elementary school, the regular classroom teachers whose students are being served by the Enrichment Specialists, will be released for professional development and time to work together. The Enrichment

Specialist will develop curriculum that may include program enhancements suggested by the regular classroom teachers, special programs, or extension programs aligned with the District's mission and goals. The intent would be that no additional workload will be created for the regular classroom teachers during the period of time that they are being replaced by the Enrichment Specialists. The job descriptions for Enrichment Specialists will be developed by a subcommittee of the Career Ladder Task Force and posted by the District. Contractual hiring processes will be used to select the Enrichment Specialists and the replacement teachers.

At the middle school level: A job description will be created by a subcommittee of the Career Ladder Task Force for Enrichment Specialists. Enrichment Specialists will each receive a salary augmentation of \$1,000 per school year. The positions for Enrichment Specialists will be posted and contractual hiring processes will be used to select from the applications received (six middle schools/60 Enrichment Specialists).

At the high school level: A job description will be created by a subcommittee of the Career Ladder Task Force for Enrichment Specialists. Enrichment Specialists will each receive a salary augmentation of \$1,000 per school year. The positions for Enrichment Specialists will be posted and contractual hiring processes will be used to select from the applications received (four high schools/40 Enrichment Specialists).

At all levels: The official teacher representative(s), appointed by the exclusive bargaining agent, serving at each building site as the Iowa Code 284 Professional Development Leader, will receive a salary augmentation of \$500 per school year (one representative for each elementary and middle school, one representative for the alternative sites, and two representatives for each high school, 38 representatives total).

### **MOC-Floyd Valley**

### **Hybrid plan including aspects of career ladder program and a pay-for-performance plan**

Mentor Teacher: The 15 teachers selected for participation in the planning phase of the Pay-for-Performance Grant will share their work in the following areas:

- a. Formative Assessments: Rubrics will be developed that guide formative assessments at each grade level.
- b. School Matrix: This is a student information management system that allows us to track individual lessons back through the curriculum and link to the objective-benchmark-standard for a particular unit.

The work will be shared with a collegial group during professional development time during the 2008-2009 school year. Mentors will be paid \$1,000.

**Student Achievement Goal:** This will be the performance-based pay component of the grant. Each teacher will meet with their respective building principal (as is required now for professional growth plans) to determine a student achievement goal that reflects student progress. The process used will be developed around the use of SMART goals and the District's work with formative assessments. A SMART goal is specific, measurable, attainable, results-based on an agreed upon criteria for student achievement between the teacher and the principal, and time bound.

Other considerations:

- a. A bonus will be awarded to each staff member who successfully attains the SMART goal. This amount will be \$730.
- b. All teachers are eligible to participate in developing student achievement goals.

**Consultant Services:** Ongoing support will be needed to successfully implement this phase of the Pay-for-Performance Plan. The following consultants were selected based upon their expertise in their field.

- a. Continued support from Lori Nebelsick-Gullett
- b. Continued support from Dr. Mike Berger, Vice-President, VIP Tone (School Matrix)

**Tiered Lead Teacher Program:** For the summer of 2009, a Tiered Lead Teacher Program is planned. Considerations for *Veteran Teacher Tier*, 15 new teachers, as selected from a formal application process:

- a. 201 day contract
- b. Serve as summer school teacher based on essential learnings or other research and design projects as determined by the Pay-for-Performance Committee
- c. Develop formative assessments based upon the pilot work done during the summer of 2008
- d. Serve as "mentor" to new staff
- e. Stipend of \$2,000 each

**Mentor Teacher Tier:** Five to eight mentor teachers selected from 15 mentor teachers previously participating. This will be a formal application process:

- a. 211 day contract
- b. Serve as mentor to new staff
- c. Prepare (plan) professional development topics and days
- d. Research and design of best practice, approved by the Pay-for-Performance Committee
- e. Inclusive School Matrix Series assessment process
- f. Receive training specific to teaching area (i.e. Project Lead the Way)

- g. Stipend of \$2,000 each

Administrative Mentor Services: Administrators involved in the Pay-for-Performance program will be compensated \$2,000 for extra duties and days specific to implement the pay-for-performance project.

### **Mt. Pleasant**

### **Pay-for-Performance**

Participating teacher awards (bonus of \$1,000) will be based upon student achievement growth in the core (math, reading, language arts) area(s) the individual directly teaches. The final performance pay decision for a self-contained elementary teacher would include student growth in math, reading, and language arts. The final decision for an elementary special education teacher would be based upon which core areas are in the Individualized Education Program (IEP) for each student receiving direct services from the special education teacher. Performance-based pay for a middle school teacher will be based on the core subject that they teach. Final bonus calculations will use only students with both a fall and a spring score. Following the fall measurement of academic progress (MAP) testing, students will develop individual and classroom learning goals with the teacher's based upon their fall achievement level. The performance bonus will be awarded if 60 percent or more of the students directly served by that individual teacher meet their targeted growth for the school year using 2008 MAP norms (Minnesota Q-Comp performance pay also uses 60 percent). Targeted growth will be determined individually against the national mean for students at that Rausch unit (RIT) or achievement level. For example:

- A second grade teacher's bonus calculation would be based upon 60 percent of the students growing to or past their targets in math, 60 percent of the students growing to or past their targets in reading, and 60 percent of the students growing to or past their targets in language arts.
- The special education teacher's bonus would be based upon the math and/or reading scores related to individual student IEP's. Sixty percent of the targets would need to be reached in reading, and 60 percent of the targets in math.
- The seventh grade language arts teacher's bonus calculation would be based upon both reading and language arts growth. Sixty percent of the reading targets and 60 percent of the language arts targets must be reached for a bonus.

If less than 60 percent of the students meet their individual targeted student growth in each core area tested, the bonus will not be paid.

### *External Evaluation*

Learning Point Associates was chosen to complete an external evaluation of the three programs. The proposed mixed method study provides data for description of pilot implementation; measurement of cost, effect, and benefit; and explanation of successes/inhibitors to program implementation (feasibility). Specifically, the following research questions will be answered:

- What is the cost-effectiveness and benefit (e.g., teacher motivation, teaching quality, student achievement) of the pilot models?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of each program design?
- How feasible is scaled implementation of the models at other sites?

The research questions were chosen to provide administrators and policymakers data on the cost and effects of enhanced teacher compensation and career ladder innovations at pilot sites and adequate descriptions of pilot implementation so that future adopters (i.e., other districts) have the information that they need to begin the change process.

The project involves coordination for quality assurance, sampling, evaluation tool development, data collection, analysis, and reporting. During the first three months (September 2008–November 2008), the team will focus on cooperative evaluation plan finalization, comparison site selection, protocol development, and data infrastructure development. The second evaluation period (December 2008–September 2009) will be devoted to qualitative and quantitative data collection and progress reporting. The third and final period will consist of data collection, data analysis, and completion of the final summative report. During this final evaluation period, student achievement data will be analyzed.



# **Student Achievement and Accountability**

## **Annual Report**

**Iowa Code Section 284.12(1)**

**Iowa Department of Education  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319**

**January 2008**

State of Iowa  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

**State Board of Education**

Gene E. Vincent, Carroll, President  
Rosie Hussey, Clear Lake, Vice President  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Kameron Dodge, (Student Member), Cambridge  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Mary Jean Montgomery, Spencer  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
(Vacant)

**Administration**

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

**Division of PK-12 Education**

Kevin Fangman, Administrator  
Mary Beth Schroeder Fracek, Administrative Consultant  
Deb Hansen, Administrative Consultant

**Division of School Support and Information**

Tom Deeter, Lead Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, *et seq.*), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.



**Iowa Department of Education  
Annual Report 2007  
As Required by Iowa Code Section 284.12(1)  
Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program**

Legislation passed during the 2001 Iowa legislative session established the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program, Iowa Code Section 284.12(1). This legislation requires the Iowa Department of Education (DE) to annually report the statewide progress on the following: student achievement scores in mathematics and reading at the fourth and eighth grade levels on a district-by-district basis; evaluator training program; team-based variable pay for student achievement; and changes and improvements in the evaluation of teachers under the Iowa Teaching Standards. The report is being made available to the chairpersons and ranking members of the senate and house committees on education, the legislative education accountability and oversight committee, the deans of the colleges of education at approved practitioner preparation institutions in this state, the State Board of Education, the governor, and school districts.

**Student Achievement Scores in Mathematics and Reading at the Fourth and  
Eighth Grade Levels on a District-by-District Basis  
2005-06 & 2006-07 Biennium Adequate Yearly Progress Report Percentage of  
Students Proficient (Iowa School Districts)**

*Blank = Not Applicable (Whole Grade Sharing)*

*\*\*\* = Not Applicable (Fewer than 10 Students)*

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
AGWSR Comm School District	76.1	86.4	74.7	79.8
Adair-Casey Comm School District	77.1	83.3	80.7	84.2
Adel-DeSoto-Minburn Comm School District	86.5	85.6	83.6	82.3
Akron Westfield Comm School District	91.4	92.9	69.5	75.6
Albert City-Truesdale Comm School District	87.5	91.7		
Albia Comm School District	76.5	77.1	67.3	73.5
Alburnett Comm School District	87.2	89.4	77.0	89.7
Alden Comm School District	66.7	83.3		
Algona Comm School District	87.7	86.4	81.6	86.2
Allamakee Comm School District	86.6	87.3	77.8	83.8
Allison-Bristow Comm School District	88.9	80.6	83.8	91.3
Alta Comm School District	84.2	84.2	69.5	76.8
Ames Comm School District	89.0	85.2	85.7	87.8
Anamosa Comm School District	83.2	87.8	75.6	76.1
Andrew Comm School District	90.3	93.5	70.8	81.3
Anita Comm School District	82.1	82.1		
Ankeny Comm School District	86.7	89.3	83.2	85.2
Anthon-Oto Comm School District	71.1	81.6	73.9	71.0
Aplington-Parkersburg Comm School District	78.8	80.8	76.2	85.7
Armstrong-Ringsted Comm School District	85.7	85.7	72.2	72.2
Ar-We-Va Comm School District	88.9	100.0	72.6	77.4
Atlantic Comm School District	75.0	79.1	67.4	78.9
Audubon Comm School District	82.5	85.0	73.6	92.5
Aurelia Comm School District	87.9	93.9	90.6	84.4
A-H-S-T Comm School District	77.0	83.8	76.0	77.3
Ballard Comm School District	88.5	91.5	74.7	75.1
Battle Creek-Ida Grove Comm School District	83.7	84.6	84.8	85.9

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
Baxter Comm School District	80.4	91.3	73.9	81.2
BCLUW Comm School District	93.2	92.0	87.5	92.0
Bedford Comm School District	88.1	96.6	77.6	86.8
Belle Plaine Comm School District	73.8	70.8	70.9	76.9
Bellevue Comm School District	84.3	87.6	82.2	75.7
Belmond-Klemme Comm School District	85.7	87.8	65.5	62.2
Bennett Comm School District	87.0	87.0		
Benton Comm School District	88.2	91.1	73.7	74.5
Bettendorf Comm School District	85.2	86.6	80.8	84.8
Eddyville-Blakesburg Comm School District	73.9	78.4	78.7	72.2
Bondurant-Farrar Comm School District	87.5	89.3	76.1	81.3
Boone Comm School District	78.6	75.4	68.2	78.6
Boyden-Hull Comm School District	76.7	80.2	75.8	84.6
West Hancock Community Schools	76.3	76.3	76.5	75.5
Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom Comm School District	78.9	84.2	71.0	69.2
North Iowa Comm School District	75.0	68.4	68.3	76.5
Burlington Comm School District	75.8	78.5	69.7	66.1
C and M Comm School District	82.6	87.0	80.3	88.7
CAL Comm School District	78.8	72.7	60.0	80.0
Calamus-Wheatland Comm School District	85.0	83.8	80.5	85.4
Camanche Comm School District	74.6	81.0	67.6	69.8
Cardinal Comm School District	74.0	75.0	69.2	72.1
Carlisle Comm School District	83.5	84.3	73.0	81.0
Carroll Comm School District	80.5	86.3	80.5	80.1
Cedar Falls Comm School District	90.0	92.5	79.7	82.3
Cedar Rapids Comm School District	76.4	77.6	73.5	76.3
Center Point-Urbana Comm School District	81.3	81.2	84.2	84.2
Centerville Comm School District	69.7	72.7	72.4	72.8
Central Lee Comm School District	85.1	91.8	67.0	68.1
Central Comm School District	82.1	91.0	83.0	81.9
Central Clinton Comm School District	89.4	90.5	79.5	82.2
Central City Comm School District	76.6	87.5	84.1	82.5
Central Decatur Comm School District	67.4	66.3	50.0	55.6
Central Lyon Comm School District	90.6	89.1	76.4	73.6
Chariton Comm School District	82.7	79.2	73.4	86.2
Charles City Comm School District	80.6	81.6	71.5	73.6
Charter Oak-Ute Comm School District	69.8	74.4	74.5	86.3
Cherokee Comm School District	75.4	78.5	76.1	79.4
Clarinda Comm School District	80.2	77.6	77.6	76.8
Clarion-Goldfield Comm School District	75.4	79.3	74.6	80.2
Clarke Comm School District	80.6	83.5	79.4	75.8
Clarksville Comm School District	81.3	91.7	62.7	62.7
Clay Central-Everly Comm School District	86.5	86.5	77.8	87.3
Clear Creek Amana Comm School District	81.0	79.1	75.5	76.0
Clearfield Comm School District	60.0	90.0		
Clear Lake Comm School District	81.9	80.4	69.3	75.9
Clinton Comm School District	75.6	78.3	68.6	69.1
Colfax-Mingo Comm School District	64.7	68.1	59.4	59.4
College Comm School District	86.9	88.5	78.0	84.4
Collins-Maxwell Comm School District	82.4	77.9	80.5	93.5
Colo-Nesco Comm School District	83.1	91.5	65.8	73.7
Columbus Comm School District	68.8	74.2	60.7	61.4

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
Coon Rapids-Bayard Comm School District	75.9	79.3	71.2	66.7
Corning Comm School District	80.3	90.2	76.0	80.0
Corwith-Wesley Comm School District	73.1	76.9		
Council Bluffs Comm School District	68.5	72.6	62.4	64.0
Creston Comm School District	75.8	74.9	67.3	69.8
Dallas Center-Grimes Comm School District	91.4	91.8	84.5	81.2
Danville Comm School District	85.9	85.9	73.0	82.0
Davenport Comm School District	70.8	77.0	60.1	62.2
Davis County Comm School District	70.4	70.4	81.4	84.3
Decorah Comm School District	90.8	92.9	90.0	92.4
Deep River-Millersburg Comm School District	87.0	91.3		
Delwood Comm School District	81.3	75.0		
Denison Comm School District	66.8	75.5	56.9	63.0
Denver Comm School District	88.0	92.8	75.2	87.1
Des Moines Independent Comm School District	65.9	71.3	57.9	60.0
Diagonal Comm School District	81.3	93.8	84.6	92.3
Dike-New Hartford Comm School District	77.3	82.7	80.2	93.1
Dows Comm School District	76.5	88.2		
Dubuque Comm School District	76.5	81.4	68.4	74.2
Dunkerton Comm School District	87.3	89.3	63.8	66.7
Boyer Valley Comm School District	81.0	77.6	80.8	73.1
Durant Comm School District	80.0	80.9	75.6	73.1
Eagle Grove Comm School District	77.7	79.5	70.9	65.2
Earlham Comm School District	67.7	78.1	68.9	80.2
East Buchanan Comm School District	80.3	78.9	68.7	80.7
East Central Comm School District	81.6	77.6	72.7	72.3
East Greene Comm School District	58.1	46.5	47.7	61.4
East Marshall Comm School District	89.9	86.2	73.5	80.3
East Union Comm School District	80.0	82.2	71.3	71.6
Eastern Allamakee Comm School District	76.6	79.7	77.0	83.8
River Valley Comm School District	85.5	100.0	68.1	71.0
Edgewood-Colesburg Comm School District	78.5	73.4	72.8	81.3
Eldora-New Providence Comm School District	73.9	81.6	70.2	81.0
Elk Horn-Kimballton Comm School District	85.7	82.9	75.0	84.1
Emmetsburg Comm School District	80.9	79.8	71.2	80.8
English Valleys Comm School District	80.9	86.8	68.3	74.1
Essex Comm School District	68.5	63.0	59.3	37.0
Estherville Lincoln Central Com Sch Dist	75.1	75.9	65.5	69.0
Exira Comm School District	70.0	77.5	77.5	70.0
Fairfield Comm School District	83.1	83.9	74.9	81.2
Farragut Comm School District	77.3	77.3	77.1	64.6
Forest City Comm School District	84.0	83.4	75.3	79.1
Fort Dodge Comm School District	71.3	76.1	61.4	67.6
Fort Madison Comm School District	84.0	86.5	82.9	84.1
Fredericksburg Comm School District	80.0	97.5	83.3	94.0
Fremont Comm School District	68.2	72.7	52.6	68.4
Fremont-Mills Comm School District	79.0	74.2	77.8	83.3
Galva-Holstein Comm School District	87.7	87.7	81.3	73.4
Garner-Hayfield Comm School District	82.1	92.3	73.8	79.3
George-Little Rock Comm School District	88.5	82.0	79.1	80.6
Gilbert Comm School District	87.6	88.2	78.1	80.6
Gilmore City-Bradgate Comm School District	73.5	79.4	75.0	72.7

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
Gladbrook-Reinbeck Comm School District	75.8	85.7	78.7	82.0
Glenwood Comm School District	86.7	84.4	76.1	79.9
Glidden-Ralston Comm School District	89.1	73.9	74.6	76.2
Graettinger Comm School District	80.0	93.3		
Greene Comm School District	81.0	92.9		
Nodaway Valley Comm School District	66.7	71.3	77.7	80.4
GMG Comm School District	86.1	91.7	82.2	89.0
Grinnell-Newburg Comm School District	86.9	84.0	75.8	81.4
Griswold Comm School District	81.0	84.8	68.8	69.6
Grundy Center Comm School District	79.7	81.0	81.3	80.0
Guthrie Center Comm School District	86.3	82.7	79.8	82.7
Clayton Ridge Comm School District	64.3	76.2	69.8	74.0
H-L-V Comm School District	74.0	82.0	70.7	80.0
Hamburg Comm School District	67.7	71.0	61.7	53.2
Hampton-Dumont Comm School District	78.4	76.4	71.3	67.6
Harlan Comm School District	88.1	84.7	81.6	84.9
Harmony Comm School District	72.9	64.6	61.6	67.1
Harris-Lake Park Comm School District	89.5	94.7	88.9	97.2
Hartley-Melvin-Sanborn Comm School District	82.7	92.2	76.6	76.6
Highland Comm School District	65.3	73.3	60.5	71.6
Hinton Comm School District	80.5	88.5	85.7	89.0
Howard-Winneshiek Comm School District	78.9	83.0	71.2	84.5
Hubbard-Radcliffe Comm School District	81.1	86.8	83.3	87.0
Hudson Comm School District	85.7	92.4	79.5	83.5
Humboldt Comm School District	80.7	82.4	71.9	79.0
Independence Comm School District	80.0	81.6	77.1	71.1
Indianola Comm School District	86.7	87.8	80.4	84.7
Interstate 35 Comm School District	84.8	83.3	77.6	78.4
Iowa City Comm School District	78.0	74.8	76.2	79.0
Iowa Falls Comm School District	80.1	84.3	69.4	68.8
Iowa Valley Comm School District	77.4	82.1	59.3	80.5
IKM Comm School District	72.9	68.8	75.0	85.7
Janesville Consolidated School District	73.2	82.9	73.7	89.5
Jefferson-Scranton Comm School District	86.6	85.2	79.1	75.1
Jesup Comm School District	75.0	80.0	73.9	73.8
Johnston Comm School District	90.6	92.3	84.4	87.5
Keokuk Comm School District	71.2	72.1	62.8	59.3
Keota Comm School District	85.4	90.2	76.1	92.5
Kingsley-Pierson Comm School District	83.1	72.9	86.8	91.2
Knoxville Comm School District	80.6	84.0	67.1	75.2
Lake Mills Comm School District	85.9	78.3	64.4	68.7
Lamoni Comm School District	79.3	87.9	65.4	78.8
Laurens-Marathon Comm School District	65.1	74.4	67.1	72.0
Lawton-Bronson Comm School District	87.3	83.1	76.1	77.0
Le Mars Comm School District	80.9	82.4	74.6	81.0
Lenox Comm School District	71.8	79.5	77.6	81.6
Lewis Central Comm School District	67.5	70.2	65.2	73.0
North Cedar Comm School District	81.3	88.8	79.9	88.2
Lineville-Clio Comm School District	***	***	75.0	83.3
Linn-Mar Comm School District	88.5	89.8	81.1	86.0
Lisbon Comm School District	72.4	78.6	68.5	84.3
Logan-Magnolia Comm School District	93.4	96.7	72.5	76.5

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
Lone Tree Comm School District	80.8	83.3	76.6	76.6
Louisa-Muscatine Comm School District	61.3	75.6	63.6	58.2
LuVerne Comm School District			89.4	91.5
Lynnvile-Sully Comm School District	83.6	80.6	83.3	91.7
Madrid Comm School District	76.5	77.6	79.0	79.0
Malvern Comm School District	84.8	87.0	59.0	53.8
Manning Comm School District	90.3	85.5	81.7	93.0
Manson Northwest Webster Comm School District	75.9	71.3	81.2	87.1
Maple Valley Comm School District	83.1	81.5		
Maquoketa Comm School District	81.1	77.6	66.9	65.2
Maquoketa Valley Comm School District	88.1	89.1	84.7	87.9
Marcus-Meriden-Cleghorn Comm School District	95.2	98.4	81.4	84.3
Marion Independent School District	80.6	84.1	67.5	81.9
Marshalltown Comm School District	67.6	68.4	62.5	69.1
Martensdale-St Marys Comm School District	72.6	83.9	64.9	77.0
Mason City Comm School District	74.5	76.8	71.4	77.3
MOC-Floyd Valley Comm School District	95.2	94.6	85.4	90.2
Mediapolis Comm School District	84.1	95.6	81.9	83.3
Melcher-Dallas Comm School District	74.5	68.1	53.4	67.1
Meservey-Thornton Comm School District			66.7	70.2
Midland Comm School District	85.1	89.6	59.7	76.6
Mid-Prairie Comm School District	77.6	74.6	71.3	76.6
Missouri Valley Comm School District	72.0	68.0	76.6	74.7
MFL MarMac Comm School District	75.0	71.3	67.6	82.1
Montezuma Comm School District	88.7	87.3	73.4	71.9
Monticello Comm School District	83.7	85.3	70.5	80.5
Moravia Comm School District	86.5	89.2	80.0	77.5
Mormon Trail Comm School District	60.7	60.7	60.0	60.0
Morning Sun Comm School District	88.9	94.4		
Moulton-Udell Comm School District	96.6	93.1	69.0	59.5
Mount Ayr Comm School District	89.9	94.4	70.2	78.6
Mount Pleasant Comm School District	82.3	79.1	68.9	70.6
Mount Vernon Comm School District	86.0	85.2	80.9	84.6
Murray Comm School District	74.5	76.6	68.1	74.5
Muscatine Comm School District	88.2	89.3	79.3	82.0
Nashua-Plainfield Comm School District	80.4	82.1	83.1	90.3
Nevada Comm School District	84.4	80.9	82.7	82.2
Newell-Fonda Comm School District	84.2	84.2	84.7	91.7
New Hampton Comm School District	87.7	82.3	65.5	73.2
New London Comm School District	78.0	71.2	62.7	65.1
New Market Comm School District	85.7	85.7	50.0	60.0
Newton Comm School District	79.5	82.4	68.6	73.7
Nishna Valley Comm School District	84.6	84.6	75.0	78.1
Nora Springs-Rock Falls Comm School District	72.2	77.8	78.5	86.1
North Central Comm School District	80.3	84.2	66.7	74.1
Northeast Comm School District	92.1	96.6	91.6	93.7
North Fayette Comm School District	89.1	81.5	76.4	73.6
Northeast Hamilton Comm School District	86.0	88.4	67.3	71.4
North Mahaska Comm School District	81.3	82.7	64.8	62.0
North Linn Comm School District	81.9	87.2	75.7	82.6
North Kossuth Comm School District	76.7	73.3	79.2	77.1
North Polk Comm School District	87.0	93.2	78.3	88.2

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
North Scott Comm School District	83.7	87.4	82.4	80.9
North Tama County Comm School District	82.9	92.1	75.9	79.5
North Winneshiek Comm School District	69.4	86.1	65.9	75.6
Northwood-Kensett Comm School District	83.9	85.7	66.2	76.6
Norwalk Comm School District	84.1	87.8	80.8	84.7
Odebolt-Arthur Comm School District	84.3	86.3	85.4	91.7
Oelwein Comm School District	80.9	83.3	65.7	76.7
Ogden Comm School District	86.3	88.2	80.5	89.0
Okoboji Comm School District	86.2	87.2	76.2	72.3
Olin Consolidated School District	86.4	77.3	53.7	65.0
Orient-Macksburg Comm School District	77.8	77.8	71.4	65.7
Osage Comm School District	85.6	81.6	76.3	82.1
Oskaloosa Comm School District	80.0	88.7	74.1	73.1
Ottumwa Comm School District	72.5	77.0	71.1	72.7
Panorama Comm School District	85.6	89.8	85.8	81.4
Paton-Churdan Comm School District	84.2	84.2	78.9	78.9
PCM Comm School District	84.7	82.0	77.5	83.6
Pekin Comm School District	89.6	88.5	68.5	70.2
Pella Comm School District	91.3	92.4	86.3	91.2
Perry Comm School District	81.0	72.7	59.2	62.3
Pleasant Valley Comm School District	86.4	90.5	77.1	83.0
Pleasantville Comm School District	86.3	89.0	76.9	79.1
Pocahontas Area Comm School District	89.3	94.6	75.5	79.4
Pomeroy-Palmer Comm School District	74.1	74.1	75.0	71.9
Postville Comm School District	62.0	73.4	75.3	75.3
Prairie Valley Comm School District	81.4	86.3	83.8	81.0
Prescott Comm School District	72.7	63.6		
Preston Comm School District	85.4	87.2	86.2	86.2
Red Oak Comm School District	71.4	74.4	69.5	64.9
Remsen-Union Comm School District	86.5	78.8	76.6	76.6
Riceville Comm School District	73.6	75.5	81.7	84.7
Riverside Comm School District	89.0	90.2	75.3	82.8
Rock Valley Comm School District	90.0	88.9	74.2	79.8
Rockwell-Swaledale Comm School District	79.2	75.0	59.1	69.7
Rockwell City-Lytton Comm School District	82.1	91.0	75.0	78.9
Roland-Story Comm School District	88.3	85.4	81.3	86.9
Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rk Comm School District	87.5	90.5	73.6	80.2
Russell Comm School District	57.9	57.9	66.7	58.8
Ruthven-Ayrshire Comm School District	87.0	95.7	60.5	72.1
Sac Comm School District	67.6	64.3	72.9	78.6
St Ansgar Comm School District	78.8	81.6	68.6	69.5
Saydel Comm School District	70.3	79.1	66.2	68.5
Schaller-Crestland Comm School District	75.4	80.3	72.9	81.4
Schleswig Comm School District	85.4	80.5	82.5	90.0
Sentral Comm School District	88.0	80.0	88.5	80.8
Sergeant Bluff-Luton Comm School District	86.7	83.1	76.7	80.1
Seymour Comm School District	60.6	54.5	73.2	82.9
Sheffield-Chapin Comm School District	88.5	85.2		
Sheldon Comm School District	88.5	85.5	78.8	92.7
Shenandoah Comm School District	79.1	71.2	68.0	68.8
Sibley-Ocheyedan Comm School District	89.0	88.1	85.1	85.7
Sidney Comm School District	59.0	79.5	51.6	75.8

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
Sigourney Comm School District	76.3	76.3	71.7	72.7
Sioux Center Comm School District	89.1	93.4	79.3	85.2
Sioux Central Comm School District	86.0	75.4	76.7	70.9
Sioux City Comm School District	70.8	70.7	62.0	63.7
Southern Cal Comm School District	88.6	88.6	66.7	77.0
South Clay Comm School District	77.8	66.7		
Solon Comm School District	85.7	83.2	77.3	80.0
Southeast Warren Comm School District	88.6	91.4	69.7	79.8
South Hamilton Comm School District	83.7	84.7	76.8	83.0
Southeast Webster Grand Comm School District	75.0	71.3	69.9	66.3
South Page Comm School District	95.8	73.9	78.8	69.7
South Tama County Comm School District	69.6	65.4	75.9	76.8
South O'Brien Comm School District	82.4	85.7	70.3	80.2
South Winneshiek Comm School District	87.3	91.9	60.2	68.7
Southeast Polk Comm School District	82.7	84.2	74.9	78.2
Spencer Comm School District	79.8	78.5	72.9	75.2
Spirit Lake Comm School District	82.9	85.7	80.6	76.6
Springville Comm School District	78.7	80.3	57.1	61.4
Stanton Comm School District	90.6	93.8	70.6	72.5
Starmont Comm School District	91.6	88.0	72.9	84.7
Storm Lake Comm School District	63.4	58.9	52.4	57.6
Stratford Comm School District	85.7	100.0		
West Central Valley Comm School District	76.0	84.6	73.3	72.2
Sumner Comm School District	82.3	87.3		
Terril Comm School District	93.3	93.3	81.4	83.7
Tipton Comm School District	79.5	79.5	82.0	88.7
Titonka Consolidated School District	76.9	88.5	70.6	66.7
Treynor Comm School District	87.3	84.3	99.0	92.8
Tri-Center Comm School District	70.1	76.6	73.9	74.8
Tri-County Comm School District	68.3	75.6	67.2	82.8
Tripoli Comm School District	87.3	87.3	71.4	85.7
Turkey Valley Comm School District	84.4	81.3	75.0	85.9
Twin Cedars Comm School District	75.7	87.1	66.7	66.2
Twin Rivers Comm School District				
Underwood Comm School District	86.7	86.7	74.8	82.9
Union Comm School District	83.6	85.7	82.9	79.1
United Comm School District	82.1	89.7		
Urbandale Comm School District	86.3	90.3	84.9	89.1
Valley Comm School District	72.4	71.1	77.5	78.7
Van Buren Comm School District	90.3	89.2	68.1	77.9
Van Meter Comm School District	88.9	91.1	76.9	84.6
Ventura Comm School District	95.8	89.6	81.4	85.7
Villisca Comm School District	68.0	82.0	68.3	81.7
Vinton-Shellsburg Comm School District	81.6	80.5	65.6	77.7
Waco Comm School District	80.0	83.3	57.0	68.6
Wall Lake View Auburn Comm School District	71.4	76.6	75.0	83.8
Walnut Comm School District	77.4	74.2	78.6	71.4
Wapello Comm School District	85.7	85.7	67.5	69.0
Wapsie Valley Comm School District	72.9	76.0	66.0	80.0
Washington Comm School District	69.5	73.2	60.4	72.8
Waterloo Comm School District	64.1	63.7	54.4	54.0
Waukee Comm School District	91.5	90.0	85.8	85.0

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading</b>	<b>8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math</b>
Waverly-Shell Rock Comm School District	85.4	83.8	84.4	91.4
Wayne Comm School District	84.7	77.8	80.2	81.1
Webster City Comm School District	87.8	86.9	73.8	80.0
West Bend-Mallard Comm School District	91.4	97.1	87.1	93.5
West Branch Comm School District	83.5	78.3	71.3	78.7
West Burlington Ind School District	69.7	59.6	72.9	68.2
West Central Comm School District	87.8	92.7	66.7	74.4
West Delaware County Comm School District	78.8	79.5	75.5	82.3
West Des Moines Comm School District	86.2	85.9	81.3	86.5
Western Dubuque Comm School District	78.5	79.6	80.1	80.6
West Harrison Comm School District	61.6	68.5	65.4	59.3
West Liberty Comm School District	65.3	69.4	61.5	76.9
West Lyon Comm School District	80.4	81.5	77.0	88.9
West Marshall Comm School District	85.1	91.1	73.4	77.7
West Monona Comm School District	71.3	67.0	69.9	78.6
West Sioux Comm School District	67.1	75.9	74.2	72.2
Westwood Comm School District	72.5	76.8	64.2	70.5
Whiting Comm School District	85.3	91.2	83.8	89.2
Williamsburg Comm School District	90.9	90.2	78.9	82.9
Wilton Comm School District	83.2	85.1	70.6	74.4
Winfield-Mt Union Comm School District	73.1	76.9	64.9	74.3
Winterset Comm School District	78.1	81.8	85.4	75.8
Woden-Crystal Lake Comm School District	57.1	64.3		
Woodbine Comm School District	85.0	81.7	73.0	88.6
Woodbury Central Comm School District	90.3	79.6	88.0	86.7
Woodward-Granger Comm School District	72.1	77.9	82.1	83.3

## **Evaluator Training Program and Changes and Improvements in the Evaluation of Teachers Under the Iowa Teaching Standards**

### **Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program (IEATP)**

During the 2002 legislative session, IEATP was mandated for any educator who wanted to obtain the new evaluator license and renew their administrative endorsement and the corresponding general administrative endorsement. The materials and training for IEATP were developed by area education agencies (AEAs), School Administrators of Iowa (SAI), the University of Northern Iowa (UNI), and the Southeast Regional Laboratory (SERVE) in cooperation with DE personnel. A statewide application process for potential trainers was implemented and 65 trainers were selected. Training began in the fall of 2002 and was delivered in five regions across the state. Over 2,300 participants were trained by June 2006.

Beginning in the summer of 2007, the training is being offered through the professional development office of each AEA. Trainers continue to be certified by the state of Iowa and ongoing support for the training comes from the DE. Higher education institutions that offer approved administrator preparation programs have integrated this new evaluator training into their pre-service school administration programs.

As a result of the 2002 legislative requirement, the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria became the statewide expectation for all teachers. The DE has developed and shared a model evaluation process and the summative evaluation instrument to be used at the culmination of the comprehensive performance review <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/538/563/>. Dr. Tom McGreal collaborated with the DE in the development of the evaluation model. The evaluator training program outlined above includes these statewide models as part of the training materials.



## **Evaluator Approval Renewal Training**

The content for the two renewal courses: *The Iowa Evaluator Approval Renewal Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* and *The Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* was developed by collaborative work with the DE, SAI, and AEAs. Evaluator Approval Renewal trainings were designed to focus on the evaluation of teachers using the Iowa Teaching Standards and the evaluation of administrators using the Iowa Standards for School Leaders. Trainers were trained during the spring of 2007. These two renewal courses are offered through the AEAs. The costs of the renewal training are paid for through registration fees.

*The Iowa Evaluator Approval Renewal Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* is designed for principals and other educational leaders who are responsible for the evaluation of teachers' skill attainment and enhancement. The areas covered in the training are:

- effective leadership practices in evaluation;
- knowledge and understanding of best practice in writing an individual career development plan;
- knowledge and understanding of best practice in writing an intensive assistance plan;
- skills in the use of effective strategies for formative conferencing; and
- skills in the use of coaching strategies.

Seventy-six trainers were certified to teach this course. Twenty-eight of these trainers delivered the training to administrators in their home district. This provided a valuable opportunity for the districts to incorporate their training with the district's local evaluation process and procedures. Initial feedback indicates that ongoing professional conversations around evaluation of teachers continue in the districts with their in-house trainer. Five higher education professors and the executive director of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (BoEE), also received this training to provide knowledge to enhance their work with Iowa administrators.

*The Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* is designed for superintendents and other educational leaders responsible for the evaluation of administrators' skill attainment and enhancement. The areas covered include:

- the application of the Iowa Standards for School Leaders;
- recognition of effective principal behaviors that increase student achievement, including use of data, alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and first- and second-order change;
- research and the application of effective superintendent behaviors that increase student achievement;
- coaching skills to enhance principals' skills as instructional leaders; and
- models of principal evaluation processes, including design and the use of an individual career development plan for principals.

Fifty trainers were trained to teach the renewal course to evaluate administrators. Eleven higher education professors and the executive director of the BoEE took part in the training to enhance their knowledge as they work with future and current Iowa administrators.

Participants took part in the first two modules September 19, 2007, when Dr. Douglas Reeves addressed the participants, followed in the afternoon by an emphasis on the Iowa Standards for School Leaders. All remaining modules take place in each AEA on the dates of the superintendents' meetings. Trainers work in pairs. Each training pair is an AEA administrator and a practicing or retired superintendent.

Iowa law currently requires that an administrator complete either *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Administrators* OR *Iowa Evaluator Approval Training Program II: Evaluation of Teachers* for renewal. Individuals may choose to take both to complete their required four hours for license and evaluator renewal. Administrators have been encouraged to take the course most pertinent in his/her current job description.

## **Evaluation Model**

The DE, in collaboration with Dr. Tom McGreal, developed a model for a local evaluation system. This model was made available to the public in August 2002 at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/538/563/>. This document provides local Iowa school districts with a basic evaluation model that can be used to shape a standards-based teacher evaluation system that will meet all the expectations of the Iowa teacher quality program. This model encourages a range of sources of data and information to document that teachers meet the

Iowa Teaching Standards. The model also incorporates the requirements for evaluation that are included in the teacher quality legislation.

### **Model Descriptors**

The DE worked with a cadre of educational experts led by Dr. Vickie Trent, UNI; Dr. Charlotte Danielson, Outcomes Associates; Dr. Tom McGreal, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois; Dr. Beverly Showers, Staff Development Consultant; and Dr. Barbara Howard, SERVE; to develop model descriptors to support the criteria for the Iowa Teaching Standards. These model descriptors are intended to help districts further define, in operational or behavioral terms, expectations under the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. These model descriptors can be located at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/542/565/>.

In June 2007, another set of model evidence (descriptors) was added at the above website. This set of evidence illustrates how a single piece of evidence can support several different Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria.

### **Comprehensive Evaluation Instrument**

The DE worked with legal representatives from SAI, Iowa State Education Association (ISEA), and the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) on the development of the summative Comprehensive Evaluation Instrument for second year teachers. This instrument is a mandated part of a local evaluation system that is required for use in the final evaluation of second year teachers. This instrument was included in the Evaluation Model issued by the DE and in IEATP training materials for participants in evaluator approval training.

### **District Evaluation Design**

Beginning July 1, 2005, all districts were required to base their evaluation of all teachers on the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria. All career teachers will be evaluated a minimum of every three years and they will annually develop and implement an individual career plan focused on the district's and building's student learning priorities and the district's staff development plan. They must also provide an intensive assistance component designed to support teachers not meeting one or more of the teaching standards. As a support for this work, the DE, in cooperation with the AEAs, conducted a statewide series of ICN sessions focused on teacher evaluation systems providing information and local school examples that have already been developed. The AEAs also have at least one consultant who serves as a liaison to districts as a person who can provide information resources and possible technical support for the district's design effort. In addition, Tom McGreal returned to the state and conducted a statewide workshop on the design of teacher evaluation systems.

The DE continues to provide support to the current evaluation design and staff development model by providing samples of district and building level professional development plans, individual career development plans, and samples of completed career teacher evaluations as support to the work of local districts and various professional organizations in order to illustrate how these components all connect with one another.

### **2007 Legislative Actions**

In an effort to continue the state's focus on teacher quality, the Iowa Legislature added several components which enhances the educator quality bill

- Funding for professional development
- Attendance Center Professional Development Plans
- Teacher Quality Committee responsibilities
- Expansion of administrator quality
  - The expansion of administrator quality creates a new Iowa Code Chapter 284A that mirrors the policy included in the teacher quality program. This expansion builds on the new administrator mentoring and induction enacted in 2006 to include statewide Standards for School Leaders, administrator professional development plans, and standards-based administrator evaluations.

## **The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program**

Every new educator enters into a two-year induction program that addresses the educator's personal and professional needs and trains him or her on Iowa's eight teaching standards. A mentor is assigned to each educator – not to evaluate for employment purposes, but to observe, critique, and provide support and advice on effective teaching practices. In 2007, school psychologists, nurses, social workers, and speech and language pathologists with a teaching license who are new to the profession were approved to participate in the mentoring and induction program.

Mentors must have at least four years of teaching experience and demonstrated skills in classroom training and coaching. They receive training on district expectations, based on Iowa's eight teaching standards. Mentoring programs can be designed by the district or the AEA, which provide school improvement services for the local education community. The mentor must follow this program while focusing on the educator's individual needs. One hundred percent of the public school districts and all AEAs in Iowa have a mentoring and induction plan that has been approved by the DE.

After the two-year induction program, the new educator receives a standard license in most cases. The state fully funds induction for the required two years. If an educator does not meet the requirements after the two years, a third year in the induction program can be granted by the district, but must be funded by the district. If the educator does not successfully complete the program after the third year, that educator cannot receive a license and cannot continue to teach in the state.

During the 2006-07 school year, 3,526 new educators participated in the state-funded Iowa Mentoring and Induction program. This total is comprised of both first and second year educators in local education agencies (LEAs) and AEAs statewide.

### **Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute**

The fourth annual statewide Mentoring and Induction Institute was held in Cedar Falls, Iowa, April 15-17, 2007. Co-sponsors included UNI and ISEA in partnership with Heartland AEA. The Institute addressed effective practices to support beginning educators from the pre-service experience to the classroom. Distinguished keynote speaker Dr. Richard Ingersoll, Professor of Education and Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, shared current research on mentoring and induction. He addressed the issues of recruitment and retention, teacher shortages, and the quality of new professionals. The New Teacher Center, University of California, Santa Cruz presented two full-day workshops for participants that provided training on structures, strategies and tools for developing expertise in teaching for both new educators and mentors, and for the support of new educators by administrators.

The Mentoring and Induction Institute conferred the annual Mildred Middleton Crystal Key Awards for Outstanding Mentoring and for Outstanding Leadership in a Mentoring and Induction Program. The awards were provided by ISEA and presented by ISEA President, Linda Nelson.

### **The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Network**

The Iowa Mentoring and Induction Network is primarily comprised of AEA staff who administer the program in their areas and is led by the department administrator of the Iowa Mentoring and Induction program, DE. The network meets semi-annually in the Des Moines area. The full-day network meetings provide information and technical assistance to AEAs and others in attendance on such topics as licensure issues for new educators, system support, Iowa mentoring and induction models, and mentoring resources.

### **Mentoring and Induction Statewide (MITS) Steering Committee**

This committee (MITS) meets several times a year and is comprised of representatives of the DE, AEAs, higher education, local school districts, and ISEA. The MITS Committee gives guidance and direction to the DE on program issues and plans and coordinates the annual Iowa Mentoring and Induction Institute. The steering committee networked with experts in the field of mentoring and induction by attending the New Teacher Center Symposium in San Jose, California, in February 2007. The committee was also selected to give a presentation at the national Symposium on Iowa's Mentoring and Induction Program at the 2007 event. The symposium, sponsored by the University of California, Santa Cruz, is attended by over 3,000 educators from the United States and several

countries around the world. Resources and information acquired at the symposium were used to enhance the quality of the Iowa Mentoring and Induction Program.

### **Mentoring and Induction Model**

The DE program administrator of Iowa's Mentoring and Induction Program co-chaired with ISEA an effort that resulted in a model for districts and AEAs to follow in developing a high quality mentoring and induction program at the local and regional levels. The model was piloted in several districts in AEA 13 and will continue throughout 2008.

### **Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant (TQE)**

In 2005, the DE was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education in the amount of \$6.3 million dollars over three years. This grant is being used to increase the effectiveness of teacher education programs for teacher candidates and will assist in collecting data on first and second year teachers in Iowa in the future. In the development of the grant application, the funds appropriated for the Iowa Mentoring and Induction program during FY 2005 were used to leverage the federal TQE funds. Funds from the TQE grant are used to support various mentoring and induction technical assistance activities that benefit LEAs and AEAs.

## **Professional Development**

### **Priorities:**

**The DE's efforts during 2006-07 to improve the professional development systems have emphasized the following priorities:**

1. Developing the capacity of school leaders and AEA personnel in Iowa to lead and support professional development at the district and building level.
2. Assisting local districts in accessing research-based instructional content through the Iowa Teacher Academies.
3. Providing technical assistance to implement the new requirements of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act (2007)
4. Providing resources to implement the Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM), District Career Development Plans, and Individual Teacher Development Plans.

### **Actions:**

**Priority 1: Developing the capacity of school leaders and AEA personnel in Iowa to lead and support professional development at the district and building level.**

The DE delivered several learning opportunities and technical assistance events to help educators learn how to lead quality professional development at the district and building level. Participants included superintendents, principals, central office administrators, professional development leadership team members, college and university representatives, and AEA staff. Capacity building efforts focused on the leadership actions needed to direct school improvement initiatives and implement professional development focused on accomplishing gains in student achievement. Examples:

- **Professional Development Leadership for School Improvement Series:** October 19-20, 2006; February 7, 2007; April 20, 2007; and June 7, 2007. Participants included 116 school administrators, AEA personnel, and teachers. Participants learned to use school improvement and professional development processes to improve instructional practices and accomplish increases in student learning. Leadership skills such as planning, supporting, and sustaining school improvement and professional development efforts were emphasized. Participants acquired skills in organizing and leading governance structures to involve the various role groups that maximize teacher and administrator leadership.
- **Instruction at the Core of Improved Student Learning: Workshop Series:** sponsored by the DE and SAI. This series was attended by school administrators, AEA personnel, and teacher leaders. Each session featured leadership actions for improving school-wide core instructional practices including how to lead professional development and increase teacher engagement in professional learning and how to implement

collaborative team structures for building teacher and administrator leadership.

- April 4, 2007 Presented by Dr. Richard Elmore: a national expert in preparing school administrators to lead school improvement efforts and in creating a community of practice for superintendents and principals engaged in the improvement of instruction.
  - June 7, 2007 Consultants from the Teaching and Learning Services Bureau shared effective instructional practices including information on adolescent literacy, as well as best practices in mathematics and science for middle school and high schools students.
  - August 7, 2007 Dr. Gordon Donaldson provided participants with tools for increasing the effectiveness of school leadership teams. (SAI)
  - August 8, 2007 SAI breakout sessions on Literacy, Mathematics and Science for School Leaders presented by Teaching and Learning Services consultants and school practitioners.
  - November 6 & 8, 2007 Dr. Eric Hart, Tonya Urbatch, and Iowa school administrators presented a workshop for school leaders on effective practices in mathematics.
- Ongoing technical assistance meetings with Iowa Urban 8 Professional Development Consultants – meetings were held throughout the year to address professional development needs of Iowa’s largest school districts.
  - In addition to training events, the DE provided technical assistance and ongoing support to the development of a statewide coordinated system of administrator development for student achievement. Iowa Department of Education personnel contributed to the Iowa Leadership Academy Design Team as this group formed a comprehensive approach to preparing school leaders. An example of the outcomes of this group’s efforts includes The Iowa Leadership Academy held on June 21-23. It provided professional development for school principals that focused on leadership skills for leading professional development and other school improvement roles.

## **Priority 2: Assisting local districts in accessing research-based instructional content through the Iowa Teacher Development Academies (ITDA)**

The ITDAs feature research-based content and are designed to support local school districts and AEAs in offering professional development that is grounded in research and based on the IPDM. The target audience for the academies is local school teams that include teachers, principals, and central office personnel as well as AEA consultants. See attached chart. The purposes of the academies are:

- To increase student achievement through quality professional development.
- To improve local district access to qualified trainers in high demand content areas (reading, mathematics and science).
- To increase the number of teachers and consultants with expertise in specific academic content areas and skills in delivering professional development opportunities.
- To support and compliment existing teacher quality program efforts. This initiative is designed to support the AEA and DE capacity building efforts by adding to the pool of available trainers in Iowa.

The DE provided the following academies: Second Chance Reading (SCR), Concept Oriented Reading Instruction, Question Answer Relationships, and Cognitively Guided Instruction. Each academy provided from seven to eight days of training distributed through the summer of 2006 and the 2006-07 school year. New cohorts of participants were offered the same academies in the summer of 2007 with training continuing through the 2007-08 school year.

Academy trainers work with teachers and their administrators to structure collaborative teams, design formative data collection, and assist with analysis strategies for both formative and summative data. Web-based procedures for reporting student results are in place.

As part of the ongoing effort to build statewide capacity to provide local districts with quality professional development, three of the academies are preparing select participants to serve as in-state trainers. For example, the SCR academy recruited and prepared 40 teachers and consultants to serve as trainers. These individuals met rigorous selection criteria and engaged in extensive training. The trainers are now fully prepared and providing SCR training to school personnel throughout the state. The DE has provided funding to help support the AEAs that hosted these sessions.

<b>Iowa Teacher Development Academy</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>
<b>Second Chance Reading</b>			
Teachers	95	91	65
AEA	25	30	13
Central Office/Principals	30	37	28
Trainers		34	40
<b>Concept Oriented Reading Instruction</b>			
Teachers	60	52	52
AEA	5	8	5
Central Office/Principals	8	13	18
<b>Question Answer Relationships</b>			
Teachers	59	59	35
AEA	8	11	2
Central Office/Principals	9	12	25
<b>Cognitively Guided Instruction</b>			
Teachers	57	93	99
AEA	12	24	15
Central Office/Principals	13	15	9
Trainers			11

### **Priority 3: Providing technical assistance to implement the new requirements of the Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act (2007)**

- Orientation for Teacher Quality Committees:** Four one-day orientation meetings were completed between August 13 and August 17, 2007. Over 1,200 participants from 225 local districts participated in one of the events. Teams included both administrators and teachers. The outcomes of this event were to enable participant to:
  - Become familiar with the scope and parameter of the Teacher Quality Legislation (SF 277)
  - Understand roles and responsibilities
  - Initiate the work of the Teacher Quality Committees
  - Recognize positive possibilities for the Teacher Quality Committees work
- Administrator Quality Program:** Work is underway to establish rules and guidance for the development of the Administrator Quality Program.
  - Superintendent Evaluation:** The DE, IASB and SAI are collaborating to develop resources to prepare school boards to evaluate superintendents. An initial workshop was delivered on November 2, 2007. A DVD and additional training resources are being produced.

- Principal Evaluation: The DE has collaborated with other agencies to develop and deliver training to prepare superintendents to evaluate principals.
- **AEA Teacher Quality Program:** Rules are in process and technical assistance is planned for March 2008.

#### **Priority 4: Providing resources to implement the IPDM, District Career Development Plans, and Individual Teacher Development Plans**

The 2007 Iowa Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Act required district Teacher Quality Committees to follow the IPDM when making decisions and monitoring the district, attendance center, and Individual Professional Development Plans. The IPDM provides a framework intended to assist districts, schools, and individuals as they develop staff development programs targeted at the learning needs of their students. It also provides guidance for local districts to use when designing, implementing, and evaluating the district professional development plan as well as individual teacher professional development plans. The DE continuously refines and adds tools to the IPDM Model Training Manual and the DE website for professional development. These resources provide detailed information for developing plans as well as overviews, recommended steps, tools, video clips, case studies, and resources <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/232/637/>

#### **Case Studies**

During the 2006-07 school year, the DE initiated the *Writing for Results Project*. The purposes of the project are to:

- Provide the opportunity for local district/building teams to reflect on their school improvement efforts, define their model of practice, and write about their experiences and results for publication/dissemination.
- Publish self-case studies in a variety of media.
- Increase the availability of state and national publications that provide examples of effective initiatives that use professional to accomplish gains in student achievement.
- Synthesize best practices across case studies.
- Build resources to support the implementation of the IPDM.
- Document the *Writing For Results Process* for future replication.

Five school district teams are participating in the project this year. Teams include school administrators and teachers.

#### **New Technical Assistance Products Distributed in 2006-07:**

- DVD of Instruction at the Core of Improved Student Learning presentation by Richard Elmore, Harvard University
- Second Chance Reading Lesson Demonstration DVDs
- DVD of the teacher quality orientation presentations
- Tools are routinely added to the DE professional development website at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/232/637/>. This year, the site has been reformatted and organized for easier access by consumers.

#### **Content Network**

The DE has added resources to the Iowa Content Networks to make more information about scientifically-based research available to local districts. The Iowa Professional Development Content Network is posted on the DE website at <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/prodev/main.html>

# **Professional Development and Market Factor Funds**

## **Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program**

Senate File 277

***Iowa Department of Education***

Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

January 2008



State of Iowa  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

**State Board of Education**

Gene E. Vincent, Carroll, President  
Rosie Hussey, Clear Lake, Vice President  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Kameron Dodge, (Student Member), Cambridge  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Mary Jean Montgomery, Spencer  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
(Vacant)

**Administration**

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

**Division of PK-12 Education**  
Kevin Fangman, Administrator

**Division of School Support and Information**  
James Addy, Administrator

**Bureau of Planning, Research, Development and Evaluation Services**  
James Pennington, Chief  
Dianne Chadwick, Administrative Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the Iowa Code sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, *et seq.*), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688), Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*).

If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.

**Iowa Department of Education  
Annual Report 2008  
as Required by Senate File 277  
Professional Development and Market Factor Funds  
Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program**

Legislation passed during the 2007 Iowa legislative session provided additional funding for Professional Development for Teachers and for Market Factor incentives as part of the Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program, Iowa Code 284. Senate File (SF) 277 requires the Iowa Department of Education (DE) to report on school district use of funds distributed pursuant to SF 277 by January 15, 2008. The report is being made available to the chairpersons and ranking members of the senate and house committees on education, the joint appropriations subcommittee on education, the legislative services agency, the deans of the colleges of education at approved practitioner preparation institutions in this state, the State Board of Education, the Governor, and school districts.

\*\*\*\*\*

Information on school districts' use of the funds provided through the 2007 enacted and signed student achievement and educator quality legislation was collected from school districts using the fall 2007 Basic Educational Data System (BEDS).

### **Professional Development**

Funds were allocated for high quality professional development for teachers in the 2007-08 school year. The BEDS certification requires the districts to certify how the school district allocated these funds and that the moneys received under this subsection were used to supplement, not supplant, the professional development opportunities the school district would otherwise make available.

High quality professional development is defined as activities that should provide for alignment with the Iowa Teaching Standards; career development needs of teachers (District and Individual Teacher Career Development Plans); research-based instructional strategies; alignment with the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan student achievement goals; analysis, theory, classroom demonstration and practice, technology integration, observation, reflection, and peer coaching; and improvement in instructional practice and effect on student learning. This would NOT include items such as mandatory trainings, parent-teacher conference days, teachers preparing in their classrooms, staff orientations, or time spent preparing grades/report cards/lesson plans.

School districts decided on the best focus for the extra professional development day according to their own perceived needs (Table 1). Many districts reported focusing on multiple content areas. Often this was because different school buildings had different needs. For example, reading might be a priority in the elementary school, but the high school needed to focus on writing.

Three hundred twenty-seven districts reported that reading was a focus area. Two hundred fifteen districts reported mathematics was a focus area. Topics included in the "other" category were very diverse and included technology, classroom management, differentiated learning, and use of data along with multiple other topics.

**Table 1. Content Focus of Professional Development**

	<b>Number of Districts*</b>	<b>Percent of Districts*</b>
Reading	327	90%
Mathematics	215	59%
Science	149	41%
Writing	159	44%
Other	197	54%

\*Many districts had more than one focus area.

In addition, districts were asked how the professional development funds would be distributed. Districts indicated that 78 percent of the total would be paid to teachers for time to participate or lead professional development.

**Table 2. Allocation of Professional Development Funds**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Salaries/Teacher Time	\$14,618,518	78%
Substitutes	\$1,399,419	7%
Professional Development Materials	\$776,275	4%
Professional Development Trainers	\$645,592	3%
Other	\$1,390,344	7%

Districts were also asked to indicate the percent of funds that will be allocated to the following implementation of the District Career Development Plans (DCDP), Attendance Center Professional Development Plans (ACDP), and Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP) (Table 3). If a particular activity was part of multiple levels, the districts were required to include the funding in the highest appropriate level. The indication was that about half of the funds would be used to implement the DCDP.

**Table 3. Allocation of Professional Development Funds by Level**

	<b>Mean</b>
Implementation of District Career Development Plans	49.8%
Implementation of Attendance Center Professional Development Plans	30.0%
Implementation of Individual Professional Development Plans	20.2%

## Market Factor Incentives

Funds were allocated for Market Factor incentives to recruit and retain teachers in the 2007-08 school year. The BEDS certification requires the districts to certify the amount allocated by the school district to specific teachers. Market Factor incentives may include salaries, educational opportunities and support, moving expenses, and housing expenses for the recruitment and retention needs of the school district in such areas as hard-to-staff schools and subject-area shortages, improving the racial or ethnic diversity on local teaching staffs, funding to prepare a teacher to attain a license or endorsement in a shortage area, or funds to support educational support personnel in pursuing a license in a shortage area.

The fall BEDS lists 760 staff members in 152 districts receiving Market Factor additions to their salary. The total amount distributed was \$1,266,574. The mean of the distribution was \$1,666 with a large standard deviation of \$1,484. The median amount was \$1,367. The range of the amounts received was very broad (\$10,078) with a minimum of \$22 and a maximum of \$10,100. The 2007 allocation for Market Factor was \$3,390,000 divided among all 364 districts. Three hundred eighteen (about 42 percent) of the 760 staff members accepted multiple assignments.

**Table 4. First Assignment Code of Staff Members Receiving Market Factor Funding**

Code	First Assignment Listed	Number
60	K-8 (General Coursework)	274
28/70/80	Special Education	175
20	Mathematics	59
17	Life and Physical Sciences	48
30/50	Support: Counselor, Teacher Librarian, At-Risk	31
04/07/09/16/24	Industrial/Technology Education	25
11	Fine and Performing Arts	23
12	Foreign Language and Literature	22
10	English Language and Literature	19
02	Business	18
05/29	Consumer and Homemaking Education	16
27	Social Sciences and History	15
08	Elective Activities	10
03	Computer and Information Sciences	7
01	Agriculture and Renewable Natural Resources	6
23	Physical Education	5
14/15	Health and Safety Education	3
22	Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies	1
25	Public, Protective, and Social Services	1
99	Other	2
	TOTAL	760

Table five is a summary of demographics of the staff members who received Market Factor funding in the 152 districts reporting. Similar numbers of new hires and retained teachers were reported receiving the funding.

**Table 5. Demographics of Staff Members Receiving Market Factor Funding**

	<b>Count</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Males	238	31%
Females	522	69%
White	727	96%
Non-white	33	4%
Beginning teachers	279	37%
Career teachers	481	63%
New hires to district	389	51%
Retained in district	371	49%



# STATE OF IOWA

CHESTER J. CULVER, GOVERNOR  
PATTY JUDGE, LT. GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
JUDY A. JEFFREY, DIRECTOR

DATE: July 23, 2008

TO: Iowa Administrators

FROM: Kevin Fangman, Administrator  
Division of PK-12 Education

SUBJECT: Guidance on House File 2679

House File 2679 made some changes to the existing Student Achievement and Teacher Quality program. The purpose of this memo is to provide updated information about the requirements.

## **A. Definition of Teacher**

(Amends Iowa Code Chapter 284.2) The definition of teacher was amended to read, "Teacher" means an individual who holds a practitioner's license issued under Chapter 272, or a statement of professional recognition issued under Chapter 272 who is employed in a nonadministrative position by a school district or area education agency pursuant to a contract issued by a board of directors under Section 279.13. A teacher may be employed in both an administrative and a nonadministrative position by a board of directors and shall be considered a part-time teacher for the portion of time that the teacher is employed in a nonadministrative position. This change in definition **will not** impact a majority of school districts.

## **B. Professional Development Funding**

(Amends Iowa Code Chapter 284.6) The Legislature appropriated an additional \$8.5 million to school districts to support professional development related to the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum. The money shall be provided to school districts for...."professional development related to the infusion and implementation of the model core curriculum." The Iowa Department of Education (Department) will refer to the model core curriculum as the Iowa Core Curriculum in all communication. Districts will use these funds for professional development related to the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum. The Teacher Quality Committees (TQCs) should be informed of the district's plan for the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum. The TQC shall allocate the funds for professional development related to the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum and will distribute the funds according to the implementation plan for their district. Formal implementation plans are not required of districts until 2010. Districts should present initial steps to the TQC for implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum in the district when they are ready to proceed. School districts are required to adopt an implementation plan for the Iowa Core Curriculum for grades 9-12 by July 1, 2010, and for grades K-8 by July 1, 2012. The district will be held responsible for the mandate of the Iowa Core Curriculum set in Iowa Code. How TQCs allocate Iowa Core Curriculum professional development funds will change from year to year as districts work toward meeting the mandate for grades 9-12 by 2012 and grades K-8 by 2014.

Grimes State Office Building - 400 E 14th St - Des Moines IA 50319-0146

PHONE (515) 281-5294 FAX (515) 242-5988

[www.iowa.gov/educate](http://www.iowa.gov/educate)

*Helping Communities Meet the Learning Needs of All Their Children and Adults*

The Iowa Core Curriculum professional development money is in addition to the \$20 million allocated in 2007-2008 for local district and AEA professional development purposes. Districts are required to certify to the Department how funds received were used (more information on data collection to follow later in the summer). The Department plans to disburse funds in one payment on or about October 15. The anticipated amount to be distributed to each district will be posted on the Department's website in mid to late August. Districts will receive one allocation from the Department with a line item for Iowa Core Curriculum professional development and one for teacher quality professional development.

**Question 1: What is the role of the TQC in determining the distribution and use of the professional development funds for the Iowa Core Curriculum?**

The TQC should be informed of the district's implementation plan for the Iowa Core Curriculum. The TQC will allocate these funds to support the district's implementation plan. The implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum is a mandate that must be implemented in grades 9-12 by 2012 and grades K-8 by 2014. Implementation plans must be in place by 2010 and 2012. The school district is held accountable by the Department for implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum. Thus, districts will have to assess their needs and the TQC will need to distribute the funds to accomplish the necessary work to comply with the law.

**Question 2: How can the professional development funds devoted to the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum be allocated?**

Local district personnel will engage in processes to infuse and implement the Iowa Core Curriculum into the district's curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. These processes will include:

- Aligning the district's standards, benchmarks, and curriculum to the Iowa Core Curriculum and ensuring that the local curriculum has the rigor and relevance needed by students;
- Identifying and communicating to teachers the content considered essential for all students;
- Engaging in a process to review instructional practices to check for consistent and accurate implementation of the essential concepts and skills; and
- Identifying professional development to support improvements in instruction and formative assessment in literacy, math, science, social studies, and 21<sup>st</sup> century skills.

AEAs will be providing a lot of information to districts as the training and materials to support districts in the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum is finalized. The training in the fall of 2008 will focus on building an understanding of the implementation process for the Iowa Core Curriculum for school leaders (see question 6). **If districts are unsure how to proceed with the implementation of the Iowa Core Curriculum, they will want to wait until after this training is over to make their initial district plans.**

**Question 3: Are there expenditures that should not be allowed as part of the Iowa Core Curriculum work?**

Iowa Core Curriculum professional development funds may not be used to pay teachers for work that occurs within the contracted school day.

Iowa Core Curriculum funds may not be used to pay for materials for students, such as textbooks and assessments. The funds may not be used to pay for technology such as computers, white boards, and projectors. The intent of these funds is to advance professional growth of teachers. Other sources of funding should be used to buy student supplies and equipment.

**Question 4: What happens to our district's allotment of the professional development funds for the Iowa Core Curriculum if our district doesn't begin the content alignment and analysis of instructional practices related to the Iowa Core Curriculum until after the end of this fiscal year (June 30, 2009)?**

Funds may be carried over to the next school year.

**Question 5: Does our district have to redo our district and building-level professional development plans?**

The professional development plans do not have to be revised to describe the work being conducted in content alignment and review of instructional practices. These stages in the Iowa Core Curriculum provide important data for planning for professional development (Iowa Professional Development Model - data collection and analysis and goal setting). Once the district determines what content and pedagogy needs to be studied to improve teaching practices, the district and attendance center plans should be revised to add or adjust the goals. The individual teacher development plans may be revised as needed to refine the individual teacher goals to reflect the new learning that is needed to respond to the challenges of implementing improved instructional practices. **If a district has well-defined goals to improve instruction and has important professional development already planned for the 2008-2009 school year, the Iowa Core Curriculum work should not immediately disrupt this professional development priority and the learning opportunities should continue as planned. Later as core content work advances, adjustments to professional development priorities would be appropriate.**

**Question 6: Should districts be ready to start implementing the Iowa Core Curriculum in the fall of 2008?**

No. Some districts that have engaged in the Iowa Core Curriculum the past two years may be ready to start some of the work. Most districts probably won't want to begin until after their administrators go through Iowa Core Curriculum leadership training that all AEAs will be delivering the fall of 2008 for district leaders.

#### **C. Whole Grade Sharing**

(Amends Iowa Code 282.10, subsection 4) When districts are negotiating their whole grade sharing agreements, their boards..... "shall negotiate as part of the new or existing agreement the disposition of teacher quality funding provided under chapter 284." This means districts must include what percentage of teacher quality funds each district will pay to the identified teachers for salaries and professional development in whole grade sharing agreements. **School districts will need to amend their whole grade sharing agreements for the 2008-2009 school year so this can be determined for the appropriate teachers.**

#### **D. Teacher Compensation**

(Amends Iowa Code 284.4) Regular compensation is now defined as...." base salary plus any salary provided under Chapter 294A." In the event a district and the bargaining unit cannot reach agreement on salary distributions related to new appropriations by September 15, then any teacher receiving a salary supplement to reach a minimum salary threshold cannot be included in the even distribution of compensation dollars for the remainder of the staff. **This means that any teacher who receives money to bring their salary up to the minimum salary requirement for beginning or career teacher defined in Iowa Code Chapter 281 is not eligible for additional teacher quality money if the district and local bargaining unit cannot reach an agreement on how new salary money will be distributed by September 15. Districts are also required to distribute teacher compensation dollars evenly throughout the year beginning with the October 2008 payroll.**



**E. Minimum Teacher Salaries**

(Amends Iowa Code Chapter 284.7, subsection 1, paragraph a, subparagraph 2) House File 2679 increased the minimum teacher salaries to the following:

- |                      |          |
|----------------------|----------|
| a. Beginning teacher | \$28,000 |
| b. Career teacher    | \$30,000 |

There are no longer two levels of minimum salaries for career teachers. Any teacher who obtains a standard license must be paid at the \$30,000 minimum for career teachers.

**F. National Board Certification**

(Amends Iowa Code 284.13, subsection 1, paragraph a, Code Supplement 2007) The state-funded annual award and registration fee reimbursement incentives will no longer be available for teachers who applied for National Board Certification after December 31, 2007. Teachers who hold National Board Certification and are receiving an annual award will continue to receive their annual award. Teachers who registered to go through the National Board Certification process by December 31, 2007, will be eligible for a \$2,500 yearly stipend if they receive the certification within the timelines and policies established by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

**Question 7: Is there any financial support available for National Board Certification?**

Yes. The Department will utilize NBPTS Candidate Subsidy funds to support candidates at 50 percent (\$1,250) of the National Board Certification fee. The funds will be prorated if the number of applicants exceeds the available funding. Candidates are responsible for submitting the initial \$500 application fee plus the \$65 processing fee and any remaining unsubsidized portion of the fee by the NBPTS application deadline. Subsidy funds cannot be allocated to a candidate who has previously utilized subsidy funding. Candidates must meet the NBPTS and the Department's eligibility criteria. For additional information go to <http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/282/1193/>

**G. Teacher Evaluation**

(Amends Iowa Code 284.8, subsection) The requirements for teacher evaluation have been changed to....“A school district shall review a teacher's performance at least once every three years for purposes of assisting teachers in making continuous improvement, documenting continued competence in the Iowa teaching standards, identifying teachers in need of improvement, or to determine whether the teacher's practice meets school district expectations for career advancement in accordance with Section 284.7. The review shall include, at a minimum, classroom observation of the teacher, the teacher's progress, and implementation of the teacher's individual professional development plan, subject to the level of resources provided to implement the plan and shall include supporting documentation from parents, students and other teachers.

**The requirement for supporting documentation from another administrator has been eliminated.** Performance reviews will **still** need to include documentation from parents, students, and other teachers. Resources to support a teacher's individual professional development plan means that in-kind and/or monetary support can be offered to support plans. There may be various in-kind supports that a district can offer to support individual professional development plans. Resources can include technical assistance provided by another teacher, curriculum director, or AEA consultant to just name a few. When the individual professional development plan is developed collaboratively with the evaluator and the teacher, and there is agreement that outside financial resources are needed to achieve the goal, then the teacher should not be held accountable for achieving the goal if the resources were not provided.

**H. Market Factor Incentive (previously known as Market Factor Pay)**

Iowa Code Chapter 284.11 has been repealed and Market Factor Pay and Incentives have been eliminated effective for the 2008-2009 school year. Funds from 2007-2008 can be carried forward and distributed according to the requirements outlined in Iowa Code and Administrative Rules.

**Question 8: The legislature is no longer funding the Market Factor Incentive portion of teacher quality. Does that mean that the district can use any remaining Market Factor amounts for any general fund purpose?**

No. Categorical funding continues to be used only for the allowable uses for which it was appropriated and allocated until all of the categorical funding has been expended by the district.

**Question 9: Market Factor was allocated to districts in two years, 2006-2007 and 2007-2008, and each of those years had different purposes. May the district use remaining funds from the first year's allocation for the purposes of the second year's allocation?**

No. Iowa Code did not include a provision to change the uses of the original allocation. Each year will be accounted for separately within the general fund using project codes and will be expended for the purposes allowed for that year's allocation.

**Question 10: Is the district still required to report to the Department how it used Market Factor funding?**

Yes. Iowa Code requires the district to certify how the district allocated both the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 funding. The district will certify the uses of the Market Factor funding on a timely-filed Certified Annual Report by using the proper project code in its revenues, expenditures, and reserved fund balances, as appropriate. In addition, Iowa Code requires that districts separately budget (local line item budget) for revenues and expenditures related to the 2008 funding.

**Question 11: What should a district do if it used its Market Factor funding for an inappropriate use?**

The district will make an adjusting journal entry to its general fund balance to increase its reserved fund balance for Market Factor, 2006-2007 or 2007-2008 as appropriate, and to decrease its unreserved fund balance.

***2006-2007 Funding: Market Factor Pay***

**Question 12: What are the allowable uses of the 2006-2007 Market Factor Pay allocation?**

The 2006-2007 Market Factor allocation is used exclusively for additional classroom teacher salaries and the employer's share of FICA and IPERS related to those additional salary amounts. The additional salary amounts shall supplement, but not supplant, (be paid in addition to) wages and salaries paid to teachers as a result of a collective bargaining agreement and as a result of funds appropriated for teacher salaries in Chapters 256D (Early Intervention), 284 (Teacher Quality) and 294A (Educational Excellence Phase I and II). The purposes for which the additional salaries can be paid are:

- Improvement of salaries due to geographic or locally determined wage differences;
- Recruitment and retention in hard-to-staff schools;
- Recruitment and retention in subject-area shortages; or
- Recruitment and retention to improve the racial or ethnic diversity of the local teaching staff.

**Question 13: Who determines locally how the 2006-2007 Market Factor Pay funding will be used within the allowable uses in Code?**

The school district has sole discretion to award 2006-2007 Market Factor Pay funding.

**2007-2008 Funding: Market Factor Incentive**

**Question 14: What are the allowable uses of the 2007-2008 Market Factor Incentive allocation?**

The 2007-2008 Market Factor Incentive allocation is used for additional classroom teacher salaries and the employer's share of FICA and IPERS related to those additional salary amounts, costs of educational opportunities and educational support, moving expenses, housing expenses, and costs of preparing a teacher or educational support personnel in the district to attain a license or endorsement in a shortage area. The additional salary amounts shall supplement, but not supplant, (be paid in addition to) wages and salaries paid to teachers as a result of a collective bargaining agreement and as a result of funds appropriate for teacher salaries in Chapters 256D (Early Intervention), 284 (Teacher Quality) and 294A (Educational Excellence Phase I and II). The purposes for which the additional salaries can be paid are:

- Recruitment and retention in hard-to-staff schools;
- Recruitment and retention in subject-area shortages; or
- Recruitment and retention to improve the racial or ethnic diversity of the local teaching staff.

**Question 15: Who is eligible for 2007-2008 Market Factor Incentive funding?**

The 2008 Market Factor funding is limited to classroom teachers or educational support personnel working toward becoming classroom teachers.

**Question 16: Who determines locally how the 2007-2008 Market Factor Incentive funding will be used within the allowable uses in Code?**

The TQC makes recommendations to the school board and the certified bargaining representative regarding the expenditures of Market Factor Incentives, and the school board makes the final decision. Market Factor Incentive is now subject to negotiation and bargaining but only for that portion being used to pay for additional teacher salaries. **Expenses such as “educational opportunities and support, moving expenses, and housing expenses...” are not subject to negotiation.**

**Question 17: Is there a time limit in which the district must expend any remaining balance?**

Any expenditure in the district's general fund that is appropriate to a categorical funding source should be coded to that categorical funding source first. The district should also use the allocation first that was received earliest by the district. The uses of Market Factor are specific enough that it may take several years before the district can expend the entire remaining balance on appropriate costs.

**I. Clarification on the Iowa Teaching Standards and Alternate Criteria**

Iowa Code, Chapter 83 was adopted by the State Board of Education in February 2008. These rules added alternate criteria for the Iowa Teaching Standards by which AEA staff who meet the new definition of teacher should be evaluated. **These alternate criteria are not to be used in the evaluation process for district staff who meet the criteria of teacher.** Nurses, guidance counselors, and other non-classroom teachers must be evaluated using the Iowa Teaching Standards and Criteria adopted in 2002. This corrects some earlier guidance that was given by the Department.

Questions? Contact Deb Hansen at [deb.hansen@iowa.gov](mailto:deb.hansen@iowa.gov) or 515-281-6131.



# STATE OF IOWA

CHESTER J. CULVER, GOVERNOR  
PATTY JUDGE, LT. GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
JUDY A. JEFFREY, DIRECTOR

DATE: September 25, 2007

TO: Administrators of Public School Districts  
AEA Administrators

FROM: Kevin Fangman, Administrator  
Division of PK-12 Education

SUBJECT: Additional Guidance on SF 277 Student Achievement and Teacher Quality Program

The purpose of this memo is to provide answers to questions that have been asked since the Teacher Quality Committee Orientation meetings were held the week of August 13, 2007. If you have additional questions, please send them to Deb Hansen at [Deb.Hansen@iowa.gov](mailto:Deb.Hansen@iowa.gov). The DE will continue to post answers to questions that are asked throughout the year on our website at [www.iowa.gov/educate/content/blogcategory/56/902/](http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/blogcategory/56/902/) under Educator Quality.

## COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

- 1. Are the teacher members of the Teacher Quality Committee (TQC) required to be members of the Iowa State Education Association (ISEA) or the local bargaining unit or do they simply have to be chosen for the committee by the local bargaining unit (if one is present)?**  
Senate File (SF) 277 only states that the certified employee organization needs to appoint the teacher representatives to the TQC. It also states that existing committees can be appointed to perform the functions of the TQC if the certified employee organization and district administration agree.
- 2. How do we balance area education agency (AEA) teachers and teachers not members of an association in the decision-making process?**  
It is hoped that student achievement will improve by increasing the engagement of teachers and administrators in participatory decision making. It would certainly be expected that the TQC would solicit input and feedback from others educators who may not be association members.

---

## DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF FUNDS

- 3. How are other districts using teacher quality (TQ) funds at the building (attendance center) and district level? I would like ideas/samples that do NOT involve bringing in a one-time speaker.**

Grimes State Office Building - 400 E 14th St - Des Moines IA 50319-0146

PHONE (515) 281-5294 FAX (515) 242-5988

[www.iowa.gov/educate](http://www.iowa.gov/educate)

*Helping Communities Meet the Learning Needs of All Their Children and Adults*

The law allows for the following use of funds - salaries beyond the normal negotiated agreement, substitute teachers, professional development (PD) materials and speakers, and PD content. Examples of how districts are using professional development funding include:

- Collaborative meeting time for teachers to engage in collective learning;
- Developing lessons that support and extend their learning from professional development experiences;
- Time to analyze student and teacher data related to the learning occurring as part of the district and building PD; and
- Hire substitutes to create release time for teachers to observe in each other's classrooms (peer coaching). The goal is for PD to be focused and ongoing throughout the school year so teachers develop the necessary skills that will transfer to the classroom.

**4. Can we use money to hire substitutes when scoring Six Trait Writing or to pay teachers for Six Trait Writing training?**

Senate File 277 does not give the TQC the authority to select the content of the PD. When the individuals who make the decisions about the content of PD plans determine that the Six Traits of Writing is the focus of district or attendance center plans, then SF 277 funds may be used to support the district or attendance center plans, as determined by the TQC.

Scoring papers is not an appropriate use of funds if it is routine scoring/grading. However, analysis and scoring of student work can be part of a professional development experience if it is a part of a PD program that follows the Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM).

**5. Are we locked into paying out certain percentages of the money?**

Once the TQC decides on the distribution of the funds allocated in SF 277 the district has to disperse the funds according to the percentages outlined by the TQC.

During the Teacher Quality Committee Orientations held the week of August 13-17, it was recommended by all three organizations (Iowa Department of Education [DE], ISEA, School Administrators of Iowa [SAI]) that a majority of the money go to district and attendance center plans. This is based on the research that shows the professional development most likely to improve student achievement is a collective-team effort, data driven, frequent and sustained over time and connects pedagogy, content and students. Funds not spent the first year can be carried over to the next year.

**6. Can PD money in SF 277 be used to pay for travel time between buildings in a school district?**

No. Current district policies should be followed for reimbursing indistrict travel.

**7. Does what we do need to be “researched based”?**

Yes. Senate File 277 does state that all professional development plans, including district, attendance center, and individual plans, must follow the IPDM as outlined in Iowa Code Chapter 284.6. Per Iowa Code the PD must contain research-based

instructional strategies aligned with the school district's student achievement needs and the long-range improvement goals established by the districts.

**8. If the TQC agrees to recommend equal distribution for funds and administration agrees, will this be legal?**

Yes. The TQC can recommend equal distribution of funds between the three groups. Senate File 277 states, "...the use of funds shall be balanced between school district, attendance center, and individual professional development plans, making every reasonable effort to provide equal access to all teachers." During the Teacher Quality Committee Orientations held the week of August 13-17, it was recommended by all three organizations (DE, ISEA, SAI) that a majority of the money go to district and attendance center plans. This is based on the research that shows the professional development most likely to improve student achievement is a collective-team effort, data driven, frequent and sustained over time and connects pedagogy, content and students. Funds not spent the first year can be carried over to the next year.

**9. Can TQC funds be used to pay teachers for curriculum writing or to hire substitutes to release teachers during the workday to write curriculum?**

Curriculum writing by itself is not considered PD. When the individuals make the decisions about the content of PD plans, they need to be aware that the research shows the need for a guaranteed and viable curriculum. However, PD should be focused on the skills and strategies that educators need to implement the curriculum in the classroom. The IPDM and rules for district and attendance center plans require that professional development include student achievement data and analysis, theory, classroom demonstration and practice, observation and reflection, teacher collaboration and study of implementation and coaching. The analysis of curriculum and the analysis of instructional strategies used in the classroom may be a part of the planning cycle as described in the IPDM. Committee work to adopt, map, or maintain curriculum should not replace the time needed to learn new instructional practices. Other district funds should be used to support these efforts.

**10. If a district decides to pay for a PD day on a per diem basis and the district is short TQ funds to pay for the whole day, is it appropriate for teacher compensation funds to be used to cover the shortfall?**

No. It would not be appropriate to use teacher compensation funds in this manner. The funds would need to be taken from the district's general fund or some other eligible funding source such as Title II or Title V.

**11. Is it appropriate to use TQ professional development funds to reimburse TQC members for travel to and from the TQ orientation meetings?**

Yes. This would be an appropriate use of PD dollars.

---

## AEA

**12. How does this impact our AEA evaluation system?**

The process of evaluation is not impacted. The teaching standards must be the basis of the evaluation process. The alternate criteria for the Iowa Teaching Standards will be developed this fall and noticed by the State Board.

**13. Will newly employed AEA staff members such as school psychologists, occupational therapists (OTs), physical therapists (PTs), social workers, etc., be eligible for mentoring and induction? Can SF 277 funds be used to pay mentors for these groups?**

"Beginning teacher" is defined as an individual serving under an initial or intern license issued by the Board of Educational Examiners (BOEE) under Iowa Code Chapter 272. Because school psychologists, OTs, PTs, and social workers are not licensed with an initial license from the BOEE, they are not eligible for mentoring and induction funding.

---

## OTHER FUNDING RELATED

**14. Is using the SF 277 money for PD to pay for an additional day of PD this year, considered supplanting the money that was formerly Pot 1 and 2?**

No.

**15. In the past, some districts have dispersed part of their PD funds on a per diem basis/not tied to any PD activity. Under the new legislation, would this be acceptable?**

No. The funds must be used for professional development.

**16. Can the PD funds be carried over from one year to another?**

Yes.

**17. When a district participates in whole grade sharing, which district pays a teacher who is employed by one district and engages in PD in the other district?**

The district that holds the contract would pay the teacher for hours beyond the contract for PD.

---

## ROLES/DECISION MAKING

**18. Who decides or approves the PD plan?**

The district PD plan is part of the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and the procedures for approving the CSIP must be followed. The school district is responsible for ensuring that the attendance center plans and individual professional development plans are aligned with the district plan.

**19. If the TQC doesn't decide on the individual plans, how can we make decisions about the distribution of funds for the three levels of plans?**

Individual professional development plans are developed between the evaluator and the educator. These plans can be developed individually or with a team of teachers. The content of these plans is not public and TQC meetings are subject to open meeting laws.

During the Teacher Quality Committee Orientations held the week of August 13-17 it was recommended by all three organizations (DE, ISEA, SAI) that a majority of the money go to district and attendance center plans. This is based on the research that shows the professional development most likely to improve student achievement is a collective-team effort, data driven, frequent and sustained over time and connects pedagogy, content and students.

**20. Does the TQC make decisions about the salary component that is awarded to districts as per SF 277?**

No. The TQC has no authority over this funding.

**21. Can the association members on the TQC block an additional PD day that was already planned from the year before?**

The intent of SF 277 was not to disrupt professional development plans that are already in place, but to give teachers and administrators a voice in district professional development activities. The association members do not make unilateral decisions for TQC. The committee should work together to reach consensus about how the funds should be distributed across the three plans.

**22. Is it okay for the TQC to become the PD committee within the district?**

A district may choose to do this. This would increase the time commitment and expand the role of the teachers and administrators who agreed to serve on the TQC.

**23. What happens when the TQC is at an impasse on how to distribute the funds?**

The TQC should strive to reach consensus rather than voting. If your committee is having a hard time reaching consensus, then it may want to obtain some technical assistance on consensus building and decision making. If no decision is made, then the money needs to be carried over to the next year.

---

### **MONITORING/COMPLIANCE**

**24. How will the work of the TQC be monitored?**

The district plan is monitored via the CSIP process. Attendance center plans are monitored during the site visit process every five years. The distribution of PD funds is reported on the Basic Educational Data Survey (BEDS).

**25. Is there a timetable for implementation?**

There is no specific timetable outlined in SF 277 for the PD component.



- 26. Do teachers have to attend PD when it is held beyond the contract day?**  
No. Teachers cannot be required to attend PD when it is beyond the work day as per the master contract.

---

### MARKET FACTOR

- 27. Can we use Market Factor funds to address racial or ethnic diversity?**  
Yes. Market Factor funds can be used to improve the racial or ethnic diversity on a local teaching staff.
- 28. Does the TQC make decisions about how the Market Factor funds are used or distributed?**  
No. The TQC has no authority over this funding. The committee only makes recommendations.
- 29. Can districts pay for advertising for unfilled vacancies with the Market Factor funds?**  
Funds can be used to support activities for positions in an identified shortage area.
- 30. What are possible options for use of Market Factor?**  
Market Factor funds from the 2007-08 school allotment can be used for “salaries, educational opportunities and support, moving expenses, and housing expenses for the recruitment and retention needs of the school district in such areas as hard-to-staff schools and subject-area shortages, improving the racial or ethnic diversity on local teaching staffs, funding to prepare a teacher to attain a license or endorsement in a shortage area, or funding to support educational support personnel in pursuing a license in a shortage area.

---

### PD PLANS

- 31. If a district serves K-12 students in one building, is one building level plan required or can districts have a K-6 and a 7-12 attendance center plan?**  
Having one plan for elementary and one plan for secondary would be appropriate.
- 32. Is there a required form or document for attendance center plans?**  
No. There will be additional guidance on how to develop attendance center plans. Watch the School Leader Update for more information.
- 33. Do we have to call our plans attendance center plans? Or can we use term building plan.**  
The use of either term is okay. “Attendance center plan” comes directly from the legislation.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS

**34. What happens to plans put in place prior to the legislation?**

The district and individual plans put in place prior to SF 277 should continue as designed. The requirements for these plans have not changed significantly. Attendance center plans are newly legislated and the rules for these plans will be completed this spring. It is anticipated that the requirements for the attendance center plans will be similar to what is required for the district plans, but with a focus on attendance center data and goals. The TQC will have an opportunity to provide recommendations to improve these plans, but they do not have the authority to make decisions about these plans.

**35. How is the portfolio impacted? Does the TQC develop evaluation forms?**

The TQC is charged with monitoring the procedures for teacher evaluation. Technically the TQC has no authority over a portfolio system, but suggestions for improving the process would be within the role of the TQC.

There is nothing in rules or guidance from the DE that indicates that a portfolio system is a required process for organizing evidence for teacher evaluations.

**36. Do we need to publish our minutes in the paper to meet the requirements for open meeting laws? Would posting minutes be adequate?**

Posting the minutes would be in compliance with the open meeting law requirement. It is not necessary to publish them in the paper.

**37. Is it okay to buy equipment such as projectors, Smart Boards, etc., with PD funds?**

No. That was not the intent of this legislation.

**38. Once the TQC determines how the PD funds will be distributed, does the school board need to approve?**

No. The statute says this committee is to “determine” use and distribution of funds, not “make a recommendation” about use and distribution of funds.

**39. Can the building administrator determine the individual teacher professional development plan goals?**

All goals are to be based, at a minimum, on the needs of the teacher, the Iowa Teaching Standards, and the student achievement goals of the attendance center and the school district. There is a provision in the Teacher Quality Act that the individual plans are to have goals beyond the attendance center PD plan. The goals are to be set in cooperation with the career teacher and the teacher's evaluator.

The individual plan should align with the attendance center and district plan. It is clear that the plan needs to be developed in cooperation with the teacher and evaluator (with consultation with the supervisor if the evaluator is not the supervisor.) It is appropriate for the individual plans to be a team plan, and it is

possible for all plans to be the same or similar if teachers have cooperatively developed similar goals as part of a collaborative process.

**40. What professional development for nurses will meet the requirements for the Teacher Quality Act?**

School nurses who are eligible for the TQ program must complete an Individual Teacher Professional Development Plan, including the requirement that professional development be based on the Iowa Teaching Standards. When determining how to apply the Iowa Teaching Standards to the learning of a nurse, school nurses are encouraged to focus on the standards and consider nursing practices that align with the standards rather than focusing on the criteria statements that describe teaching practices. The individual plan also needs to address:

- the needs of the "teacher" – (replace "teacher" with "nurse")
- the student achievement goals of the district - consider professional development related to the health and well-being of students that school nurses need to know and be able to do that will contribute to student learning. Developing learning opportunities for nurses may be best accomplished through collaboration within AEAs or cross-district collaboration.

The DE is currently developing alternate criteria for the Iowa Teaching Standards for professions other than teachers. These alternative standards will be useful to nurses.

# **Professional Development Funds**

## **Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program**

Iowa Code 284.13

***Iowa Department of Education***  
Grimes State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

January 2009

State of Iowa  
**Department of Education**  
Grimes State Office Building  
400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St  
Des Moines IA 50319-0146

## **State Board of Education**

Rosie Hussey, President, Clear Lake  
Charles C. Edwards, Jr., Vice President, Des Moines  
Sister Jude Fitzpatrick, West Des Moines  
Brian Gentry, Des Moines  
Wayne Kobberdahl, Council Bluffs  
Valorie J. Kruse, Sioux City  
Max Phillips, Woodward  
LaMetta Wynn, Clinton  
Kameron Dodge, Student Member, Cambridge  
Vacant

### **Administration**

Judy A. Jeffrey, Director and Executive Officer  
of the State Board of Education  
Gail M. Sullivan, Chief of Staff

**Division of PK-12 Education**  
Kevin Fangman, Administrator

**Division of School Support and Information**  
James Addy, Administrator

**Bureau of Planning, Research, Development and Evaluation Services**  
James Pennington, Chief  
Dianne Chadwick, Administrative Consultant

It is the policy of the Iowa Department of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, gender, disability, religion, age, political party affiliation, or actual or potential parental, family or marital status in its programs, activities, or employment practices as required by the *Iowa Code* sections 216.9 and 256.10(2), Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d and 2000e), the Equal Pay Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 206, et seq.), Title IX (Educational Amendments, 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681 – 1688) Section 504 (Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.).

**If you have questions or grievances related to compliance with this policy by the Iowa Department of Education, please contact the legal counsel for the Iowa Department of Education, Grimes State Office Building, 400 E 14<sup>th</sup> St, Des Moines IA 50319-0146, telephone number 515/281-5295, or the Director of the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 111 N. Canal Street, Suite 1053, Chicago, IL 60606-7204.**

**Iowa Department of Education  
Report 2009  
As Required by Iowa Code 284.13  
Professional Development Funds  
Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program**

Legislation passed during the 2008 Iowa legislative session, provided additional funding for professional development for teachers as part of the Student Achievement and Educator Quality Program, Iowa Code 284. Iowa Code 284 requires the Iowa Department of Education (DE) to report on school district use of funds distributed pursuant to House File 2679 by January 15, 2009. The report is being made available to the chairpersons and ranking members of the senate and house committees on education, the joint appropriations subcommittee on education, the Legislative Services Agency, the deans of the colleges of education at approved practitioner preparation institutions in Iowa, the State Board of Education, the Governor, and school districts.

Information on school district use of the funds provided through the 2008 enacted and signed Student Achievement and Educator Quality Legislation was collected from public school districts using the fall 2008 Basic Educational Data System (BEDS).

#### Professional Development

Funds were allocated for high quality professional development for teachers in the 2008-09 school year. BEDS certification requires the districts to certify how the school district distributed these funds and that the moneys received under this subsection were used to supplement, not supplant, the professional development opportunities the school district would otherwise make available.

High quality professional development is defined as activities that align with the Iowa Teaching Standards; career development needs of teachers (District and Individual Teacher Career Development Plans); research-based instructional strategies; Comprehensive School Improvement Plan student achievement goals; and improvement in instructional practice. This would not include items such as mandatory trainings, parent-teacher conference days, teachers preparing in their classrooms, staff orientations, or time spent preparing grades/report cards/lesson plans.

School districts decide on the best focus for the extra professional development day according to their own perceived needs (Table 1). Many districts reported focusing on multiple content areas. Often this was because different school buildings had different needs. For example, reading might be a priority in the elementary school, but the high school needed to focus on writing.

Three hundred seventeen districts reported that reading was a focus area. Two hundred fifteen districts reported mathematics as a focus area. Topics included in the “other” category were very diverse and included technology, differentiated learning, and school climate along with multiple other topics.

Table 1. Content Focus of Professional Development

	Number of Districts*	Percent of Districts*
Reading	317	88%
Mathematics	215	59
Science	133	37
Writing	160	44
Iowa Core Implementation	264	73
Other	175	48

\*Out of 362 districts. Many districts had more than one focus area.

In addition, districts were asked how the professional development funds would be distributed. Districts indicated that 74 percent of the total would be paid to teachers for time to participate or lead professional development (Table 2).

Table 2. Allocation of Professional Development Funds

	Total	Median of the Districts	Percent of Total
Salaries/Teacher Time	\$13,972,380.60	79%	74.2%
Substitutes	\$1,860,873.67	5%	9.9
Professional Development Materials	\$912,193.22	0%	4.8
Professional Development Trainers	\$921,731.14	0%	4.9
Other*	\$1,174,293.31	0%	6.2
Total	\$18,841,471.94		100.0

\*Out of 362 districts. Many districts had more than one focus area.

\*Includes unallocated funds.

Districts were also asked to indicate the percent of funds that will be allocated to the implementation of the District Career Development Plans (DCDP), Attendance Center Professional Development Plans (ACPDP), and Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP) (Table 3). If a particular activity was part of multiple levels, the districts were required to include the funding in the highest appropriate level. The indication was that about half of the funds would be used to implement the DCDP.

Table 3. Allocation of Professional Development Funds by Level

	Median of the Districts
Implementation of District Career Development Plans	50%
Implementation of Attendance Center Professional Development Plans	25%
Implementation of Individual Professional Development Plans	20%

Districts also received professional development funds specifically for the Iowa Core Curriculum. The districts were asked how the Iowa Core Curriculum professional development funds would be distributed. Districts indicated that more than half of the total would be paid to teachers for time to participate or lead professional development (Table 4).

Table 4. Allocation of Iowa Core Curriculum Professional Development Funds

	Total	Median of the Districts	Percent of Total
Salaries/Teacher Time	\$4,256,107.93	60%	53.2%
Substitutes	\$1,390,410.77	17%	17.4
Professional Development Materials	\$546,417.41	0%	6.8
Professional Development Trainers	\$327,694.83	0%	4.1
Other	\$1,486,994.65	0%	18.6
Total	\$8,007,625.59		100.0

Districts were also asked to indicate the percent of funds that will be allocated to the implementation of professional development at the district-wide, attendance center, and individual level (Table 5). If a particular activity was part of multiple levels, the districts were again required to include the funding in the highest appropriate level. The indication was that 60 percent of the funds would be used for district-wide professional development.

Table 5. Allocation of Iowa Core Curriculum Professional Development Funds by Level

	Median of the Districts
District-Wide Professional Development	60%
Attendance Center Professional Development	25%
Individual Professional Development Plans	0%

Similarly, area education agencies (AEAs) were allotted professional development funding from the educator quality legislation. All 10 AEAs reported multiple focus areas (Table 6).



Table 6. Content Focus Areas of AEA Professional Development

	Number of AEAs	Percent of AEAs
Reading	7	70%
Mathematics	6	60%
Science	6	60%
Writing	4	40%
Iowa Core Implementation	6	60%
Other	9	90%

The AEAs were asked how the professional development funds would be distributed. The AEAs indicated that most would be paid to teachers for time to participate or lead professional development (Table 7).

Table 7. Allocation of AEA Professional Development Funds

	Teacher Quality		Iowa Core Curriculum	
	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Percent
Salaries/Teacher Time	\$799,535.28	69%	\$285,341.66	58%
Substitutes	\$25,000.00	2	\$0.00	0
Professional Development Materials	\$14,868.51	1	\$4,250.00	1
Professional Development Trainers	\$40,204.00	3	\$24,287.96	5
Other*	\$278,920.27	24	\$178,494.80	36
Total	\$1,158,528.06	100	\$492,374.42	100

\*Includes unallocated funds.

The AEAs were also asked to indicate the percent of funds that will be allocated to the following implementation of professional development at the district-wide, attendance center, and individual level (Table 8). If a particular activity was part of multiple levels, the AEAs were required to include the funding in the highest appropriate level. The indication was that more than 62 percent of the regular funds and more than 90 percent of the Iowa Core Curriculum funds would be used for district-wide professional development.

Table 8. Median Allocation of AEA Professional Development Funds by Level

	Teacher Quality	Iowa Core Curriculum
District-Wide Professional Development	62.5%	90%
Attendance Center Professional Development	17%	0%
Individual Professional Development	16%	0%